

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1906.

THE scheme for the international excavation of the buried city of Herculaneum, to whose prosecution Prof. Waldstein has devoted himself with such unflagging and unselfish enthusiasm, appears to be entering on a new and more promising phase. As early as 1904 the Italian Government gave it all the countenance which governments can be expected to accord to such projects; and Prof. Waldstein's personal advocacy in France, Germany, and the United States had evoked a most encouraging response, when the enterprise was checked for a while by a counter-agitation upon Italian soil, which made the Government hesitate. The matter has, however, since been referred to a Royal Commission (*Commissione centrale delle Antichità e Belle Arti*), which reported favourably, and the opposition seems to be now upon the wane. Having regard to the magnitude and the importance of the undertaking, it is greatly to be regretted that its inherent difficulties have been enhanced by the intrusion of influences as mischievous now as in the times of the historian of Rome: 'factio respectusque rerum privatarum quae semper offecere officientque publicis consiliis' (Livy, ii. 30).

In redemption of the promise made in our last issue we give some further particulars of the transformation of this journal which will take effect next year. The Advisory Committee of the new *Classical Review* will include in addition to the names published in October those of Prof. R. M. BURROWS, Mr. S. H. BUTCHER, M.P., and Miss E. PENROSE. The first number will be published in February, and the second in March. As it will not be possible to produce a number of the *Classical Quarterly* by January, the first issue will be in April, and the 1907 volume will accordingly consist of three numbers only. Subject to readjustments which future experience may show to be advisable, the spheres of the two periodicals will be approximately as follows. Original articles will as a rule be published in the *Quarterly*, and notices of books as a rule in the *Review*. Summaries of periodicals, classical and archaeological, will appear in the *Quarterly*, and the remaining matter in the *Review*.

The triennial performance of a Greek play at Cambridge will take place on November 30th and following days. The play selected is the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus, and the arrangements as to music, scenery, and so forth will follow the lines of those of the performance of the same drama in 1885.

A PECULIARITY OF CHORIC RESPONSION.

(Continued from p. 346.)

I have presented the facts from tragedy first, because they were the first to strike me and with them I am most familiar. And indeed I feel that some apology and some explanation is needed before I pass to the facts from lyric poetry. That, although the tragic 'rhyme' has been a familiar thing to me since 1889, I did not, until quite recently, make investigations elsewhere; that in fact this paper was written, in its first form, and despatched, before I had even seen Blass' *Bacchylides*; this, strange as it may seem to readers of the *Class. Rev.*, will cease to seem strange if the writer is allowed to state that his occupation nowhere demands of him any acquaintance with Greek poetry, that his leisure has, in the first place and the second, other claims on it, and that he dwells at the other end of the world. As the opportunity of revising this paper luckily offered itself, I determined, since any value it might have lay entirely in the collection of facts, to make that collection complete.

And indeed, there is one question which one can by no means avoid. If it stands so with tragedy as I have stated it to stand, how stands it with Mezger's 'recurrent words' in PINDAR?¹ Are they really *κρυπταὶ κλαῖδες* to the poet's meaning, or are they merely unconscious iterations as Mr. A. B. Cook (*Class. Rev.* xvi 266) maintains? Perhaps not altogether the first, but certainly not altogether the second. They come under our rubric *Ia*, and are imbedded in a mass of rhyme which can be arranged under nearly all the rest. I proceed to give the facts, premising only that I follow the same principles as with the tragedians, being perhaps a little more stringent in regard to the admission of slight instances, and almost entirely ignoring irregular correspondence. *Olympia* I (Schroeder) 1 ἄριστ=30 χάρις δ'; χρυσός=41 χρυσέ; 2 -ε διαπρέπ=13 -ελαίαι δρέπ; 11 ἐστίαν=98 ἐστίαν; 14-15 ἀγλαΐζεται δὲ καὶ μουσικῆς ἐν αὐτῷ=90-91 νῦν δ' ἐν αἰμακουρίας ἀγλαΐσει μέμικται, and for sense of 14-15 cf. 102-3; 15 -ώτῳ=33 -οἱποι=44 -ῆδης; 17 ἀμφί=35 ἀνδρί=

¹ Mezger I know only at second-hand and I have deliberately refrained from searching him out: I take as definition of his 'recurrent words' that given by Prof. Bury *Nemean Odes* p. xx 'a practice of the poet to repeat some particular word in the same verse and foot of different strophes or epodes.' With the Bury-responses, as one might call them, I have plainly nothing to do.

93 ἀμφί=104 ἀμφό; 18 χάρις=65 πάλιν; 21=39 παρέχων=50 -α κρεῶν; 29 -μένοι=58 -μενοι; 31 τιμάν=48 -τίμουν; 36 ἀντία προτέρων=47 ἀντικά φθονερῶν; 42=100 ὕπατον; 43 χρόνι=101 νόμῳ; 49 μαχαί=96 ἀκμαί; 50=108 -αῖσι; 51 φάγον=69 80 γάμον; 59 ἀπάλα=70 -α παρά; 77 ἐπί=106 ἐπί; 95=106 -εται; 98 μελιτόεσσαν=109 γλυκυτέραν (κέν?) Π 3 Διός 'Ο=63 βίοτον=70 Διός δ; 4 ἀκρόθινα=84 ἔνδον ἐντί=91 'Ακράγαντι; πολέμον=31 θανάτον=44 πολέμον; 5 τετραορίας=52 ἀγωνίας; 7 εὐωνύμων=34 εὐθυμῶν=47 ἐγκωμίων=94 εὐεργέταν; τε πατέρων=47 τε μελιών; 16=96 δίκαι; 17 χρόνος ὁ πάντων=57 ὅτι θανόντων=77 πόσις ὁ πάντων (the trouble in 76-7 does not touch this though A omits δ); θέμεν ἔργων=97 θέμεν ἔσλων; 19 χαρμάτ=99 χάματ; 20 παλῖγκοτον δαμασθῆν=40 παλαιάφατον τέλεσεν; 25 βρόμῳ=92 νόμῳ; 26 b Παλλάς=33 b ἄλλοτ=73 b ἄλλα; 30 'Ἰνοῖ=50 'Ἰσθμοῖ; 33 b for sense cf. 53 b; 42 ἔπεφνε (Triclinius, πέφνε vett., πέφνεν 'Φοι Schroeder)=89 ἔπεχε; 45 τιμώμενος=52 πειρώμενον; 60 φράσαι=100 φράσαι; 72 -πνέουσιν=85 -ετοῖσιν ΠΙ 3 ὕμνον ὀρθώσαι=18 ξυὸν ἀνθρώποις; 4=34 ἵππων; 15 'Ολυμπία=30 'Ορθωσία IV nil V 4=20 πόλιν; -τρόφον=17 λόφον V I ὑπο=43 ἱπό; 2 κίονας=86 πόμαι; 3 πάξομεν . . πρόσ=24 βάσομεν . . πρόσ; 4 χρή=74 χρῆμ; 5 ἐν Πίσαι=12 ἐν δίκαι=26 (ἐν 'Ο) λυμπίαι; 7 αὐδαῖς=91 αὐδᾶν; 9 ἀρεταί=72 ἀρετάς; 10 κοίλαις=31 κόλποις; 16 -αῖσι=79 -αῖσιν; 17 μάντιν=38 μαντευσ; 21 μελίφθογγοι δ' ἐπιτρέψοντι Μοῖσαι=105 ἐμῶν δ' ὕμνων ἀεζ' εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος; Μοῖσαι=42 Μοῖρας; 22 σθένος=71 γένος; 23 τάχος=44 φάος; 23-4 find an echo in 73; 25 ἐξ ἁλλᾶν=74 ἐξ ἁλλων; 28 Εὐρώτα=49 Εὐάδνα; 33 δόμεν=47 -δόμεν; 34 οἰκῆν=48 οἰκῶ; 35 γλυκεῖ=91 γλυκὺς; 36 -οῖο=57 -οιο; 39 -όκροκον=60 -οτρόφον; 43 ἐρατᾶς (which has been questioned, see Schroeder)=85 ἐρατειν; 52 ἀκούσαι=66 ἀκούειν; 55 καὶ παμπορφύροις ἀκτῖσι βεβρηγμένους ἄβρόν=76 αἰδοῖα ποτιστάξῃ χάρις εὐκλεία μορφάν; 68 θάλος=96 κράτος; 70 θέσθαι=98 δέξαιτ; 77=98 'Αγυσία; 83 -θέλοντα=104 εὐντα; 84 ἐμά=105 ἐμῶν; 86 πλέκων=93 -έπων V Π 1 φιάλαν ὥς=20 ἐθελήσω; 2 -δον ἀμπελ=21 -νὸν ἀγγέλ; 4 οἰκοθεν=23 πατρόθεν; 5 ἐν δ=43 ἐν δ; 6 ὁμόφρονος=63 καὶ εὐφρονα; 8 φρενός=40 χρεός; 10 νικῶν-τεσσ=86 νικῶνθ' ἐξ; 12 παμφώνοντι=44 68 ἀνθρώποισι; 14 'Ρόδον=33 νομόν=71 τέκεν=90 ὁδόν; 15=91 εὐθν; 17 πατέρα=36

πατέρος; 18 Ἀσίας=94 θαλίας; 20 Τλα-
πολέμου=77 Τλαπολέμωι; 21 λόγον=27 νόθον
=46 ὁδόν; 28 θενών=47 φρενών=60 θεόν=
79 θεώι; 30 χθονός=87 λόγον; 34 ἔνθα=72
ἐπτά; 72 προτέρων=91 πατέρων and cf. gen-
eral sense; 74 ἔχον=93 ἔχει VIII 5=34
-μένων; 10 στεφανα=76 στέφανος; δέξαι=
32 (στέφανον) τεῦξαι; 13 ἀγαθών=57 ἐρέω;
20 κρατέων=64 ἀέθλων; 30 -ομένα=52
-όμενος; 33 -μένον=70 μένος=77 μέρος; 34
πολέμων=78 -ομένων; 42=86 ἀμφί; 46
τετράτοις (τετράτοις Ahrens Schroeder)=68
τέττασιν; 63 ἔργ=85 ἔργ IX 4 -μόστωι=32
τόξωι; 5 -βάλων=71 μολών; 9 ποτε=37 τό
γε; Λυδός=93 κύκλον; 13=31 ἀμφί; 16
-αῖσιν (contra codd.)=72 -αῖσιν; 17 πάρα=
35 λόγον=45 γόνον; 33 Φοῖβος=89 οἶον;
Ἀΐδας=99 -αλία; 34 σώμαθ'=90 -γῶνα; 37
ἐπει=47 ἔγειρ'; 42 ἀσται=88 Ἀργεῖ; 44
δόμον=72 μόνος=90 μένεν; 70=88 παῖς; 88
-σχεθε=98 φέρε X 2 παῖδ=65 παῖς; φρενός;
=8 χρεός; 4 χερί=94 χάριν; 7 χρόνος=64
τόνον; 10 κατακλύσσει=94 ἀναπάσσει; ῥέον=
46 πέδον=52 σχεδόν=67 τέλος=73 -ρον; 11
λόγον=53 μόνος; 12 χάριν=69 -αῖσιν; 16 ἐν
Ὀλυμπιάδι=58 σὺν Ὀλυμπιάδι; νικῶν=100
ἀλκῇ; 19 Πάτροκλος=40 ἄπορον; 20 ποτί=
104 ποτε; 21 πελόριον=42 ἀλώσιος=63
ἀγώνιον; ὁρμάσαι=42 ἀντάσαι; 23 πάντων=
44 πάσαν=71 Φράστωρ; φάος=92 σταθμόν;
29 ἀέκονθ'=71 ἄκοντ'; 30=93 -εῖσαι;
Κλεωνᾶν=66 ἐλαύνον; δάμασε=87 μάλα δέ;
31 ποτί=46 τό δέ; 39 νεῖκος=102 κείνον; 42
θάνατον=63 θέμενος=84 κάλαμον=105 πότμον
ᾶ (πότμον 'Bekkero teste unus e Thomm, Ξ'
Schroeder: θάνατον cett.); 43 ἔλσαι=91
Γέρφας; στρατόν=49 πάγον; 45 -θεον ἄλσος
=87 νεότατος; 50 -φθέγγατο=86 ἐξ ἀλό-; 51
τελεταί=66 Τεγείαν; 52 μὲν ἄρ=73 μέγαν;
ἄρα=67 -φερε=94 ἀνα-; 63 -ελών=84 -λέων;
66 ἱκεν... κυδαίνων=87 ἱκοντ... θερμαίνει;
75 φάος=90 -τατος; 76 τέμενος=97 -τόμενος;
85 φάνεν=91 ἄτερ XI 3 νεφέλ=9 ἐθέλ-; 5
ἀρχ=11 Ἀρχ XII 3 τὴν γὰρ ἐν πόντῳ
κυβερνῶνται θαλαί=9 τῶν δὲ μελλόντων τετύ-
φλωνται φραδαί and note the exact corre-
spondence of word-size, ἐν πόντῳ cohering
XIII 1 -ολυμπιο=101 Ὀλυμπίαι; 3 ξένου=
26 γένου-; δὲ θερά=34 Νέμεα=95 βέλεια;
δὲ θεράποντα=26 χρόνον ἅπαντα; 5 -κουρον=
28 οὔρον=97 -κουρος; 6 -νομία=98 Νεμείαι;
7 Εἰρήνη=53 Μήδειαν=61 Πειράνας; 9 ἐθέ-
=47 ἔπε=93 ἐμέ; 11 τέ μοι=95 χερσίν; 16
ἔβαλον=64 μέγαρον; 18 πόθεν ἐξέφανε=64
ποθέων ἔπαθεν; 23 b αἰχμαῖ=92 b ἀρχαί-;
24 εὐρύ=93 εὐθύν; 25=33 -εσσιν; 26 χρόνον
=34 Νέμεα=49 Φίδι=72 ἀνά=95 βέλε-; 27
νέμον=96 ἐκόν; 28 οὔρον=74 εὔρεν; 29 δέξαι
τε=75 δεῖξέν τε; 30 δρόμον ἄν=53 θεμέναν;
δρόμον=61 σφετέ=84 ἔλε; 31 θνατός=62

κλᾶρον; 37 Πυθοῖ... τε Ἷοι=98 Ἷσθοῖ... τέ
μοι; 39=85 ἀμφί; 52 θεόν=75 θεᾶς; 53
πατρός=76 -ατο; θεμέναν γάμον=61 σφετέ-
ρον πατρός; αὐταί=76 αὐτά; 57 -ότερα=103
-όμενα; 59 Ἑλέν... ἀμύπαν=82 θέμεν.
-ἀναῖ; 68 ἄγε=114 ἀνα (imper.); 73 τέρας=
104 γε μάν; 79 -έσθαι=102 -έχθαι; 80 ὅταν
=103 τότ' ἄν XIV nil Pythia I 1 -πόλλων-
=81 πολλών; 2 ἀρχά=8 κνώσσων=68
-θρώπων; 4 -βολάς=44 βαλεῖν; 5 καὶ τὸν
αἰχματάν=11 ἐγγέων ἀκράν; κεραυνόν=71
Κρονίων; 7 κελαιν=27 μελαμ-; Ἷοι νεφέλαν
=87 τοι φέρεται; 8 κατέχευας=22 προχέοντι;
10 -όμενος=24 -ομένα=70 -όμενος; 14 πόντον
=74 πόντωι; 14 Πιερίδων αἰόντα=94 καὶ
λογίσι καὶ αἰοῖσι; 15 ὅς τ' ἐν αἰνῇ Ταρτάρῳ
κεῖται, θεῶν πολέμιος=95 τὸν δὲ ταύρωι χαλ-
κῶι καυτήρα νηλέα νόον; 19 b -ανία=39 b
-αλίαν; 20 Αἶτνα=60 Αἶτνας; 20 b χύνος=
60 b φῆλιον; 22 -χέοντι=62 θέλοντι; 23 ἐν
ὄρφν- =89 ἐν ὄργ-; 24 βαθεῖαν φέρε=64 -ες
αἰεὶ μένειν=90 -αν αἰεὶ κλένει; πλάκα=44
παλά-; πατάγωι=50 ἐφέπων=90 δαπάναις;
25 κείνο=31 κλεινός; 26 δεινοτά=32 γέιτονα;
30 -υμίαν=70 -υχίαν; 35 λόγος=95 νόον; 38
καὶ σὺν εὐφώνοις θαλίας ὀνυμαστάν=98 μαλ-
θακὰν παῖδων ὁρόισι δέκονται; 40 b -ανδρόν=
80 b ἀνδρῶν; 41 -ρεταῖς=87 -ρεται; 43
αἰνῆσαι... Ἐλπομαι=83 αἰανής... ἐλπίδας; 44
βαλεῖν=64 μένειν=90 κλένει; 45 ἀμεν-
σασθ'=65 Ἀμύνκλας; 50 δίκαν=90 λίαν;
52 τερόμενον=66 γέιτονες ὦν; 57 χρόνον
ὦν=77 ἐρέω; 63 καὶ μὲν Ἡρακλεῖδαν
=83 αἰανής ταχεῖας; 64 τεθμοῖσιν ἐν=84
ἐσλοῖσιν ἐπ'; 65 -ιεύς=91 -ίει; 68 λόγον ἀνθ-
=82 κόρος ἀμβ-; 73 οἶα... ὦν ἀρχαί=93
οἶον... ὦν ἀνδρῶν; 76 Σαλαμῖν... χάριν=96
Φάλαριν... φάτις II 2 δαυμόνια=26 μαινο-
μένοις; 4 μέλος=12 σθένος; 5 -έρων=37
-έπων=85 -έων; 6 στεφάνοις=14 ἀρετᾶς=62
ἀρεταί; 7 ἔδος=63 νεός; 8 ἀναγασθ=40
παλάμαι; 9 χερί=57 φρενί; 10 -ώνιος...
κόσμον=26 -ὦν βιώ... ὀλβον; ὅταν=34 ὄραν;
12 θεόν=60 -τερον; 13 ἐτέ=37 μεθέ; ἀνήρ
=29=37; 14 εὐαχέα=62 εὐανθεία; 15 κελ-
δέοντ'=63 κελადέων; 19 καμά=67 κατά; 23
-όμενον=71 -όμενος; 25 -έσσι=33 -εσσιν ἐν=49
-εσσι; 27 Ἴφρας ὅτ' ἐράσσατο=35 εὐναὶ δὲ παρά-
τροποι; 29 τάχα=37 γλυκύ; παθών=77 ἄλω-;
30 ἔχε=78 μάλα=86 νόμον; ἀμπλακίαί=54
-μαχαναί; 32 -τιστος=80 -τιστός; 33 θαλάμοις
=81 ἀγαθοῖς; 34 Διός=50 θεός; 37 53 61
compare sense; 38 εἶδος=54 εἶδον; 40
παλάμαι=64 πολέμων; 41 b πεσών=89 b
ἔδω; 47 ἀμφοτέρως=71 ἀντόμενος; 48 -οῖοι
το=72 -οῖ οἶος (Tricl.); 49 ἅπαν=57 σάφα;
ἅπαν ἐπ=81 -ατα δ' ἐπ-; 51 βροτῶν=75
βροτῶν (Bergk cum libris) βροτῶν (Heindorf
Schroeder); 52 ἐτέροις=60 ἑτερόν; 57
-ευθέραι φρεν=73 εὖ πέπραγεν; 63 θράσος;
c c 2

87 στρατός; 70 ἄθρη=94 ἀρή; 72 παρά=96 ἀγα; 74 καρπών=82 ἀστών; 76=84 ὑπο-ΠΙΠ-ιδαν=31 -ἰδα; 2 -εών=48 -έων; εὔασθαι=25 εὔασθη; 3 ζῶειν τὸν ἀποιοχόμενον=56 ἄνδρ' ἐκ θανάτου κομίσαι; 4 -ανίδα=11 'Αἰδα; γόνον=11 δόμον=27 σκοπὸν=103 γόνον; -α Κρόνου=57 Κρονίων; βάσσαισι=34 κρημνοῖσιν; -τερον=34 τερος=80 -τέρων; 5 ἀνδρῶν=12 παίδων=58 αἰθων; φίλον=12 Διός; ποτέ=74; 6 γυιαρ=52 γυίοις; 7 ἀλκτῆρα τοὺς μὲν=84 τὴν δέ=100 τοῦ δέ; Φλεγύα=24 μεγάλαν; 9-10 cf. 101 for sense and recurrence of τόξοις; 10 τόξοισιν ὑπ' Ἀρτέμιδος=26 λέκτροισιν ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας; 11 χόλος=103 ὁδόν; 13 φρενῶν . . κρύβδαν=29 νόμι . . κλέπτι; πατρός=98 πατήρ; 14 cf. sense of 99; 15 καθαρὸν=61 -θάναντον; 17 παμφώνων . . -αῖων=86 ἀνθρώπων . . αἰών; 24 -αν ἀΐσαν=100 ἀθανάτα; 26 Ἀρκαδίας=72 -ας χάριτας; 27 ἄρα=34 παρά; -ῶνι τόσσας=50 -ῶνι λύσας; 30 βροτός=60 ποδός; 37 σπέρματος . . -ίστωσεν=53 φάρμακα . . ἔστασεν; 41 ψυχᾷ=64 θυμῷ; γένος . . ὀλέσσαι=110 θεός . . ὀρέξαι; 45 καὶ βά νιν . . Κενταύρωι=68 καὶ κεν ἐν . . -αν τάμνων ('τέμνων libri, τάμνων Mommsen; prll II³⁴. Schroeder); 47 μόλον=100 μόνον; αὐτοφύτ=93 ἀμφοτέ; 48 πολίωι=101 πολέμωι; χαλκῷ=94 χρυσέαις=101 τόξοις; μέλη τετρομένοι=101 ἀπὸ ψυχῶν λιπών; 52 -άπτων=105 ἀνδρῶν; 58 ἐνέσκιμψ=74 ἔλεν Κίρρ; 60 αἶσας=76 -αῖσας; 66 -ασχεῖν=89 οἱ σchein; 68=91 -ονίαν; 72 χάριτας=95 δὲ χάριν; 75 ἀστέρος οὐρανίου=105 ὑψητεπᾶν ἀνέμων; 80 ὀρθὰν ἐπίσται=96 ἔστασαν ὀρθάν; 82 τὰ μὲν ὦν=105 ἀνέμων; 88 βροτῶν=111 πρόσω IV 1 ἀνδρὶ φίλωι=239 ἀνδρὰ φίλας; 2 εὐίππων=117 λευκίππων; -κεσίλαι=71 Περίαν=94 Περίας; -σίλαι=33 -σίδα=56 -ἰδα=163 -λίαι=217 -ἰδαν; 3 -ειλόμενον=34 -ειγομένους; -όμενον=141 -αμένους; 4 -έων=150 -έων=165 ἑκών; αἰγτ (Mosch.)=8 αἰχματ; -ητῶν=119 -ήσκων; 6 χρησεν=60 χρησμός=190 μάντις=198 φθέγμα; Λιβύας=259; ἱερὰν=190 ἱεροῖς; 7 λιπών=130 δραπών; εὐ=30 76; 8 -όντι=85 -οντος=284 -οντα=292 -αντος; 12 ἡμθέισ=211 ἡμθέων; Ἰάσωνος=119 Ἰάσωνα; 13 παῖδες=59 νιέ; θεῶν=51; 14=290 γὰς; 17 -ίνων=86 γίνω; 19 μεγαλὰν πολίων=134 Πελία μέγαρον; 20 -έσθαι=273 ἔσσαι; 21 θεῷ=274 θεός; (δι)δόντι=67 δώσω; 23 δέξαι=161 δέρμα=253 ἔθθα; Κρονίων=115 Κρονίδα; 26 ἄμερ=256 ἄμαρ; 29 φιλίον δ' ἐπέων=52 -νεφών πεδίον; ἐπέων=60 κελάδωι=213 βελέων; 30=130 -τεσσιν; 31 -ῶτον=131 -ῶτον=269 -ῶρον; 34 ἀρούρας=149 ἀρούρας ('ἀρούρας tacite Boeckh, quem omnes secuti sunt praeter Bergkium; prll II⁸⁴. Schroeder); 35 δεξιτερὰι=96 δεξιτερῶι; μάστ=219; μαστενσ=73 μάντευμ; 36 Ἔιν

(Hermann)=197 Ἔοι; -αῖσιν=281 -αῖσιν; θορών=59 λόγῳ=258 χρόνῳ; 37 χειρὶ=129 ξείνι; δέξατο=244 δ' εἶχετο; -ονίαν=98 πολίαν; 38 αὐτάν=168 ταύταν; κατα=283 κακάν; ἐκ=53 ἐν=122 ἐξ=130 ἐν=268 ἐν=291 ἐν; 40 -ομέναν=63 -όμενον=132 -έμενος=293 -ομέναν; -τρυνον θαμά=178 -τρυνον πόνον; 41 θεραπόντ=271 χέρα (Mosch.) προσ; 43 χθόνιον=112 δνοφερόν; 47 -γεινομένον (ἐπιγεινομένον Schroeder)=93 -μειβόμενοι=185 λειπόμενον; -ομένων=262 -ομένους; 48 κείναν=125 κείνον; εὐρεῖαν=140 τραχέαν; 49 ἐξ=72 ἐξ=126 ἐκ=264 ἐξ; Μυκανᾶν (see Schroeder)=279 Κυράνα; 50 -ρήσει=142 Κρηθεί; -αἰκῶν=150 -αἰκῶν; 52=259 νᾶσον; -αινεφών=98 -αιγενέων; -έων=121 190; πεδίον=259 πεδίον; 53 -πόταν=199 -πνοῶν; 55=78 χρόνοι; 57 ἦρα (see Schroeder)=210 ἦ βα; -ρα Μηδείας=218; Μηδείας=126 Μεσσάνας=172 Ἀλκμάνας; ἐπέων=210 ἀνέμων=218 τοκέων; στίχες=210; 58 πνικινᾶν=73 πνικινῶι; 60 ὠρώσ=267 ὀρθαῖς; κελάδωι=121 γλεφάρων=290 κτεάνων; 61 πεπρωμένον=84 πευρώμενος; 62 Κυράνας=261 Κυράνας; 63 τίς=86 τις; 64 ἦ μάλα . . μετά=271 χρῆ μάλα . . χέρα (Mosch.); 65 μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας=157 μέρος ἀλικίας; 66 κίδος . . ἔπορεν=112 κίδος . . δνοφερόν; 71 κίνδυνος=186 -κίνδυνον; 73=96 θυμῷ; 74 ματέρως=166 καρτερός; 75 παντῶς=98 ἀνθρώπ; 77 -ωλκοῦ (Ἰωλκοῦ Schroeder)=85 ὄχλου; 79 αἰχμασίαν=148 (ἀ)κόντεσσιν διδύμωις=117 δὲ δόμους=209 διδύμωι ('διδύμοι Be Ambr; P ii 9, ii 172, iv 79, I viii 17 in gen fem consentiunt libri' Schroeder); ἀμφοτέρα ('Ee utraque paraphr [coniecerat Hecker Phil V 439], ἀμφοτέρον vulgo [non in scholl] Schroeder)=102 ἀντροθε γάρ; ἔχεν=286 ἔχει; 80=118 ἐπιχώριος; θαητοῖσι γυίοις=264 Ἔοι θαητὸν αἶδος; 81 στέγετο=165 τέλεσον; Φρίσσ=242 Φρίξ; 83 -αἰθυσσον=198 ἀκτίνες; 84 ἐστάθη=99 ἐξανῆ; 87 Ἀπο=225 ἀπό; Ἀπόλλων=294 Ἀπόλλων; 91 ὀρνύμενον=114 183 πορφυρέοις; 94 ἀνά=171 τάχα=186 παρά; 98 ἔμμεν=259 ἔνθεν; 99 ψεύδεσιν=199 σάμασιν=268 τεύχεσιν; 101 λόγοις=116 λόγων; 104 εἰκοσι=142 εἰδοῖσι; 105 οὐτ' ἐπος ἐκτρέπελον=128 μελιχίσιτοι λόγοις; κείνοισ=243 κείνον=281 κείνος; 106-ομέναν=198 -ύμεναι=267 -ομένα; 117 ἴσσε=263 γινώθι; πατέρων=148 προγόνων; 118 ἄλλων=187 ἄλλοις; 121 γλεφάρων=244 γενῶν; 123 γόνον=145 ὅμο; 126 ταχέως=164 τάχος ὄτρ; 127 μοῖραι=196 μοῖραν; 128=189 Ἰάσων and sense; 131 ἄωτον=269 -α χωρον; 136 -άσων=297 ἀστών; 138=299 ἐπέων; 140 ἐρπῶν=240 -επτον; 141 ὀργάς=279 ὀρθᾶς; λοιπόν=256; 147 ἐξέφειν=162 βελών; 148=278 τιμάν; μήλα=194 Ζῆρα; 149 ἀγέλας=264 μεγάλας; 154

ξυνᾶς=192 -κύρας; 155 κακόν=178 πόνον=270 φάος; 159 γὰρ εἰν=205 ἀγέλα; 160 -όντας=183 -οντας; 163=186 ἐπί; 168 -αινήσαντες=222 -αινῆσάν τε; 171 Κρονίδα=194 -ρανιδᾶν; 173 Ἔννο=280 -έννο; -θέντες=257; ἀλκάν=288 -ἀγκῆ; 174 κλέος=281 νέος; 175 ἐσλόν=236 κέντρον; 177 ἔμολεν=284 ἀμαθε; 184 γλυκύν=207 βαθύν; πόθον=276 θέμεν; 191 Μόψος=268 μόχθον; 192 κρέμασαν=246 τέλεσαν; 194 ὠκυπόρους=209 κραιπνότεραι; 195 ἀνέμους=210 ἀνέμων; 195 ἐκάλε=233 ἐόλει (Boeckh); 197 αἰσιον=266 λοῖσθαιον; 198 -ες στεροπαῖς=236 ἐξεπῶνας' (Hermann, -ης' libri Schroeder)=259 -ας ἔπορεν; ἀπο=290 ἀπό; 201 ἐνίπτω=247 συνάπτει; 203 στόμα πεμπόμενοι=226 χθόν' ἀμβιόμενοι; -όμενοι=272 -οτέρους; 210 αὐταῖς=218 αὐτάν; 213 δξυτάτων οἱ ὠκυτάτων=244 λαβροτατάν; 214 τετραράκμων=245 πεντηκόντερ'; -αμον=268 -ανον; 215=269 -αισα; 224 ἀδαμάντινον=247 κατ' ἀμαξίτον; 234 ἀνάγκαι οἱ ἀνάγκας=288 ἀνάγκαι; 235 ἔντεσιον=258 ἦθεσι; 236 -πῶνας' (Hermann -ης' libri Schroeder) ἐπὶ τακτ=290 -τὸ γὰς ἀπὸ τε κτ=248 οἶμον . . σοφίας ἐτέ=294 οἶκον . . -ποσίας ἐφέ; 251=274 -εῖσι; 255 ὄλβου=263 ὄζους; 263 -έκει=278 φέρειν=286 ἔχει; 270 Παιάν=293 νοῦσον; 280=288 -ότατον V 2 καθάραι=106 δαπανᾶν; 3 -όντος=14 ὄλβος; ἀνάγρη=65 ἐθέλη; 4=77 πολύν; ἐπέταν=108 ἐρέω; 5 Ἀρκεσίλα=109 ἀλικίας (cf. IV 65=157); 7b ἀπό=38b νάπος; 10 -μέριον=52 πῆδιον; 11 μάκαιραν ἐσίταν=53 πατρώϊαν (Mosch.) πόλιν; 15-16 τὸ μὲν ὅτι βασιλεῖς ἐσσι μεγαλᾶν=97-98 βασιλεῖς ἱεροὶ ἐντί μεγαλᾶν; 19 -μενον=81 -μῆναν; φρενί=102; 21=52 ᾄδῃ; ἑλῶν=103 νέον; 27 Ἐπει=58 περί; 29 -όντων=60 -όλλων; 31 -ταλίας=62 ταμίαι; γέρας=124 (irreg.); 38 ἀμειψέν=49 μναμεία (μναμείον οἱ μναμήιον)=69 μαντείον (οἱ μαντήιον)=80 Καρνείε (for variants see Schroeder)=100a ῥανθείσαν; 53 πατρω=84 πάτραν; 65 οἷς ἄν=76 μοῖρα; 66 -όλεμον=108 -όμενον; 72 τὸ δ' ἔμ=103 τὸν ἐν and sense VI 3 ἐριβρόμου=30 -ἀρίμβροτον; 6-9 sense cf. 15-18; 17 νίκαν=26 τιμᾶς; 18 -αἰαις=27 -εῖρεν; 29 νοῆμ=47 νόμι; 32 ἵππος=50 ἵππει (reading doubtful, see Schroeder); 37 ἔπος=46 -ένος; 42 πρὸς=51 προσ- VII nil VIII 1 Ἡσυχία=68 ἁρμονίαν (cf. Aesch. Pr. 569=579); 2 μεγιστόπολι=22 δικαιοπολις; -όπο=9 κότον=29 -σχολος=42 ὁδόν=49 -όνος=69 -ον ὄσ; 3 καὶ πολέμων=10 δισμμένων=43 μαρναμένων; 4 ἔχοισα=24 θυγούσα; 7 σὺν ἀτρεκέι=54 σὺν ἀβλαβεῖ; 8 τὸ δ' =28 τὰ δ=48 ὁ δ=61 τὸ δ' =88 ὁ δ; 12 μάθεν=45 σαφές; 14 φέροι=87 -μένος; 17=37 οὐδέ; Γυγάντων=57 -εὶ βάλλω (βάλλω=77 βάλλων)=97 -των ἀνδρῶν (so Heyne for ἀνδρῶν ἔπεστιν: the rhyme cuts the

ground from beneath Bergk's proposed reconstruction); 18 νόμι=98 στόλοι; 24 ἔχει=91 ἔχων; 25 -αν ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς=65 -ασας οἶκοι; 28 -πρέπει=68 βλέπειν; 31 λύραι=44 φνῆ; 32 ἐν ποσί=92 ἐν δ' ὀλί; 40=60 -ατο; 56 χαίρων=76 δαίμων; 67 νόμι=74 -φρόνων; 76 sense cf. 96; 87 δεδαγμένοι=94 σσεισωμένοι IX 1 ἐθέλω=51 ἐρέω=109 ἐπλετο; 2 -οισιν=77 -οῖσι; 3 -κράτη=86 κρατη=111 πατήρ; 6f. cf. 56 f. for sense and repetition of χρύσε-; 6 δῖφροι=81 διφρη; -μῆλου=64 μῆλων; 8 θάλλοισαν=108 θαπτόν; 14 ἥρωος=64 μῆλων; 16 λέχει=108 ἐπεί; 34 ὀρέων=51 ἐρέω; 36 -εγεγκύν=53 ἐνέικαι; 38 εἰν=88 -εα=105 ἔβαν; 40 ὁμῶς=115 ποδῶν; 41 (ἀδείας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον) εἰνᾶς=66 (τερπνᾶν γάμον κραινῖν τε)-λευτάν; 44 Ἄνα=119 ἄπα; 46 ἀνα=96 καλά; 54 ἀγέραις=104 ἐγείραι; 56 δώμας=89 κωμάς; -ασιν=64 -άσι; 70 ἄμφ. . -έθλοισ=120 ἄμφ. . πέπλοισ; 81 -ωνος=114 -ωνος; 83 Καδμείων=108 καὶ ξείνων; 106 -κομον=114 χορόν X 1 -αἰμων=55 -αῖων; 2 μάκαιρα=26 κατ' αἶσαν; -φοτεράς ἐξ=20 φθονεραῖς ἐκ; 4 παρά=10 γλυκύν=28 βροτόν (Schmid, βρότεον)=46 μακά; 12 -γενές=42 γεγε=48 θάνα=60 ἐτέ; 13 ἐν πολε=49 -ἐν ποτε; 15 βαθυ=51 ταχύ; 19=61 τῶν δ; 20 λαχόντες=26 κατ' αἶσαν=62 τυχῶν κεν; θεῶν=38 -θῆνων; 21 ἐπι=57 ἐτι; 30 ἀγῶνα=66 ἀγων ᾄ; 35 εὐφαιμίας=53 ἐγκωμίων; 42 ἱερὰ γενεᾶ=48 λίθινον θάνατον=60 ἑτέροις ἐτέρων=66 φιλέων φιλέοντ'; 44 θρασυαῖαι=56 γλυκεῖαν; 48 φέρων=60 ἔρω=66 ἄγων; 51 χθονί=69 ὅτι; 60 text doubtful, if φρένας be kept it will rhyme with 66 -φρόνων XI 2 b Νηρηίδων=7 b ἡρωίδων; 4 χρυσῶς=20 χαλκῶ; 10 ἄκραι=21 ἀκτάν=42 ἄλλαι; 11 ἐπταπίλοισι Θήβαις=27 ἀλλοτρίαισι γλώσσαις; 15=63 -ραισι; 16 νικῶν=32 ἴκων; 20 πολί=52 πόλιν; 35 νέα κεφαλὰ=51 ἐν ἀλικαίαι; 39 ἰών=55 ἐλῶν; 39 b ἄνεμος=55 b -όμενος; 50 b -αἶμαν=55 b αἰνάν XII 8 -άνα=24 -ώνων; 11 μέρος=19 μέλος; 17 Δανάας . . χρυσοῦ φαμ=25 διανισ- . . χαλκοῦ θάμ-Nemea I 3 Ἀρτέμιδος=21 ἁρμόδιον; 4 σέθεν=22 θάμα=29 σέο=47 μελέ; 5 θέμεν=59 θέσαν; 6 μέγαν=31 μεγά; 7 Νεμέ . . -φόροις=25 ἐτέ . . ὁδοῖς; 11 μεγάλων=47 μελέων; 16 b πολέμων=52 b κολεοῦ; 17 ἐλαῖαν=35 ἐς αἶγλαν; 19 ἔσταν=55 ἔστα; 22 -δαπῶν=47 -άτων; 24 φέρειν=31 ἔχειν=49 λέχει; 25 ἀντί . . ἐτέρων . . -ασθαι=68 ἀντι . . βελείων . . -εσθαι; 32 κοιναί=61 ποίαις; 35 θαπτάν=71 -αν Ἡβαν; 54 κραδία=72 Κρονίδαι II 2 -οιοί=22 ᾄδῃ; 4 κατα=9 θαμὰ (μὲν)=19 παρὰ (μὲν); 9 νικᾶν=14 ἀλκά; 11 Πελεῖάδων=16 παλαίφατον III 5 -όμενοι=13 πρότεροι=76 τόδε τοι; 7 μάλιστ=15 Ἀριστ-; (ἀ)οιδάν=21 Μοῖσαν; 8 στεφάνων=37 Τελαμών; 11 κείνων=53 Χείρων

(Χίρων Schroeder, as everywhere, but see Dr. Headlam here, 1905, p. 148); 12 πόνον=46 φόνον; 15 κλείδας=49 -πειτ' ἄν=70 πείραι; 17 δὲ πλαγῶν=38 μετ' ἀλκάν; 20 προτέρω (Hermann, πρόσω 'schol N ix 109' Schroeder)=62 ὀπίσω; 24 τεναγέων=66 κελαδέων; 24 ῥοάς=67 βοάς; 28 γένει τε Μοῦ=57 γόνον τέ 'Γοι; 30 ἀνδρί=72 ἀνδρά; 31 ἔλαβες (-χες Bergk)=65 ἔβαλεν; 32 ἀρεταῖς=74 ἀρετᾶς; 39 ποτε.. ἀκμάν=81 -ῶθε.. ἄγραν; φόβος ἀνδροδάμας.. φρενῶν=60 ἀλαλὰν Λυκίων.. Φρυγῶν; 53 ἔπος ἔχω=66 ὅτι νέων; 54 ἔπει=75 -έπει; 58 αὖξων=79 αὖλων IV 3 Μοισῶν=11 ὕμνου; -όμεναι=67 -όμενοι=75 -όμενος; 4 οὐδέ=20 οὐνεκ=28 οὐ τε; ὕδωρ=20 -ῶν; -ακά=20 παρά=52 κατὰ=66 -ενός=92 -ατα; τεύχει=84; 5 εἰδολογία=45 ἁρμονίαι; -ορος=29 ἔλεν=53 πόρον=61 -φερειν=69 -τρεπε; 6 ῥῆμα=86 γλώσσων=94 ῥήμα; 8 γλώσσα=40 γνῶμαν; 9=81 θέμιν; Κρονίδα=25 Τροίαν (Τρωίαν codd.); 13 f. sense cf. 85 f.; 15 θαμά κε=95 μαλακά (Schmid for μαλθακά); 17 στεφάνων=25 Τελαμών (=49 Ἀχιλεὺς)=41 ἀρετάν=73 ἀέθλων; 19 Ἀθανᾶν=83 ἀπάσας; 21 ἀέκοντ' =85 Ἀχέροντ; 22 Αἰγίνας=46 Οἰνώνας; 25 κραταίος=89 γεραῖος; 27 πολεμιστ=51 -πτόλεμος; 29 -βεβαῶτας=77 στεφάνων πα; 31 λόγον ὁ=79 πρόπολον=95 μαλακά (see on 15 =95); 34 -όμεναι=58 -όμενος; 36 ἔμπα.. ἔχει=76 ἔνθα.. ἔχοντ; 34 βλέπων=55 -τραπῶν; 52 ἐξοχοι=92 ἐξοχώ; 54 ποδί=70 ποτί; 59 θάνατον=75 -θέμενος; 66 ἔδραν=74 ἔβαν V 6 τέρειναν=30 ἐπείρα; 7 Νηρηίδων=25 σεμνὰν Θέτιν; 8 -ραιρειν=44 -ραρειν; 10 Ἑλλαντίον=22 ἐν Πολίωι; 33 ἀπα=51 ἀνά; 39 θρασῆ=45 -ράτειν VI 2 -μενα=9 -μεναι; 5 νόον=12 Νεμέ=34 ἔνεκ=56 λέγετ; 10 πεδίον=32 -ερίδων; 13=57 μεθέπων; 15 -νεσιν=37 -νεσι; 19=41 -μενος; 20 λάθαν=64 ἄλμας; 40=62 -ῶαν VII 2 σθένε=73 σθένος; γενέτειρα=23 παράγοισα; 4 τεάν=ε τάν Boeckh, ἐτάν Bergk, ἐάν or ἐάν codd.=75 ἔα; Ἡβαν=12 ἀλκαί=96 ἀλκάν; 6 εἵργει=14 ἔργοις=77 εἵρειν; ἕτερον ἕτερα= (35 Νεοπόλεμος ἐ-Christ, Νεοπτόλεμος codd. Schroeder)=48 τρία ἑπέτα δι=56 -σαν ἀνελόμενον=98 -σθενία βίοτον; σύν=14; 8 εὐδοξος=100 εὐδαίμων; 10 -ακιδᾶν μάλα=31 Ἀῖδα πέσε; -πειρον=86 ξείνον; ἀμφέπειν=73 ἐμπεσείν; -έπειν=28 52 ἔχει; 13 ἔχοντι=47 ἐόντα; 17 -αῖον=101 -ειον; 20 ἔλπομαι=104 ἀμπολεῖν; 21 λόγον=63 κλέος=84 ὀπί; πάδαν ('olim me bardum et stupidum dicebam' because I could not understand Bergk's ἡ πάθ' ὦν, now I rejoice that Schroeder has openly denied that it is Greek)=42 μάχας; 22=93 ἐπεῖ; -ανᾶι=85 πάτραι; 23 -όν δ' ἔχει=52 -ον δ' ἔχει; 25 δέμεν=46 δόμεν; 30 πόλιν=85 πολί; -εται=43 -έται;

31 ἔν=52 ἐν; -εται=86; 34 χθονός=47 -σκόπον=68 χρόνος; δαπέδοις=89 ἀνέχοι; 36 =70 ἀπο; 45=87 ἔμμεναι; -εναί=74 -εται; 48 δίκαν=90 Γίγαν; 53 τέρπν'=74 τερπν; 68 μαθῶν=97 -βάτων; 69 εἰ πάρ=98 εἰ γάρ VIII 3 ἐτέραις=37 ἕτεροι; 5=39 ἐπι; 6=23 ἀμφ; 8 ἄριστος=25 μέγιστον; 9 αῶ=38 ἀδών; 14 ἀστῶν=31 ἄλλων; φέρων=48 -φορον IX 3 ἐς Χρομί=8 μὲν βρομί=43 ἐν κονί; Χρομί=28 Κρονί; 4 παίδεσσ=14 παῖδες; αὐδᾶν=49 φωνά; 5 ἐπόπταις=50 προφάταν; 6 λόγος ἀνθρώπων=41 πόρον ἀνθρώποι; 7 δ' ἐπέων=17 Δαναῶν; 8 ἀνά=18 ὄγα; μὲν βρομίαν=43 ἐν κονίαι; 11=51 -αῖσι (17 Bergk's proposed λαγέται=42 ἀμέραις); 22 ἱππεῖ=32 -ἱπποῖ=52 ἱπποῖ; 25 βαθύ=40 βαθν; 26 μαχατάν=50 βιατάν; 27 (μαχατάν) θυμὸν=37 θυμὸν (αἰχματάν)=47 κῆδος; 29=54 ταυτάν; ἀνά=34 παρά; 33=48 -εται; 35 ἔκρινας=50 ἔγκρινά; 38 ποτί=48 -πόσι; 44=54 σύν; 45 λαχῶν=50 -άτω X 1 Δαναοῦ=79 καμάτον; χάριτες=73 -δαριδᾶς; 2 φλέγετ=44 μάλα=62 γένετ; 3 ἔργων=75 τέγγων; (θρασ)έων=39 ἔων (Θρασ); 4 -έος=58 θεός; 5 πολλά=41 ὁμμά; παλάμαις=59 πολέμοι; 6 -ψαφον=12 καρπῶν; 8=56 ἔπ; βέλειςιν=38 θαμάκις; 9 -μοιο=57 -μοῖον; 10 ἀριστεύει=28 Ἀδραστείωι=46 ἀριθμῆσαι; 11 Ζεὺς=29 Ζεῦ; Δανάαν=65 παλάμαις; μολῶν=83 φηγῶν; λόγον=23 κρίσιν (=41 -τρόφον by Rauchenstein's conjecture)=77 ἀναε; 12 φρενῶν=78 -μένωι; 13 θρέψε=67 ἔνθεν; 18 ἀλοχος Ἡβᾶ=36 ἔμολεν Ἡρας; ματέρι=72 -ᾶ δ' ἔρις; 20 ἀνθρώπων=62 -ων πάντων; 22 λάβε=28 δαπέ=82 ἄγε; 24 -φόρων (=.. πόνων)=78 πόνοι; 26 καὶ τὸν=80 καὶ τόδ; -ροσαι=44 κρόκαις; 31 περί=85 περί; 32 ἐσχάτων=68 ἔμβολον; 35 ἑλαίας=53 θάλειαν; 38 -έισσο=44 -εἰσσο; -εἰσοί=80 ἑσσί; 44 ἐπείσο=80 ἔπος Ἑσσί; 48 δρόμοι.. σθένει=60 χολω.. ἀκμαί (Ραυω, αἰχμαῖ); σύν=84; 50 Πολυδεύκης.. σφίσιν=68 Πολυδεύκης.. φλάσαν; 54 μάλα=72 ἄμα=90 ἀνά; 59 φθιμένοι=83 θάνατον; 60 λόγχα=84 ἐγγεῖ; 75 θερμά=81 σπέρμα XI 3 θάλαμον=35 ἀνάγων; 7 θέων=17 χρεῶν; 22 γονέων.. βίαν=38 γενεαῖς.. σθένος; 25 καὶ παρ'=36 Isthmia I 1 τὸ τεόν=58; 10 στεφάνος=21 στεφάνων; 15 χερσί=66 χείρα; 23 δρόμοις=57; 36 -ειδόμενον=53 -ειβομένους II 3 ῥίμφα.. ἐτόξευον=35 μακρά.. ἀκοντίσσαιμ; 5 εὐθρόνον=26 χρυσέας; 18 πόρε=39 ποτε; 24 ἔργον=35 ὄργαν; 35 δισκίσεις=40 ἐμπνεύσας III (rhymes with IV) 1 τυχῆσαις=43 τύχοιμεν; 3 sense cf. 3 21 27 39; 4 μεγάλοι=64 Μεγάροι; ἔποντ=46 λεόντ; 5 ἐκ σέθεν=5 σύν θεῶι; -πιζομένων=29 -ριζόμενοι; 7 χρή μὲν ἱμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν=43 κεύον ἄψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνον; 10 γλυκεῖαν=22 παλαιάν; 11 ἐν βάσαισιν=65 ἐν θυμῶσιν;

12 νάπαι . . Θήβαν = 60 ἄναξ . . Ἥρας; 13 = 13 ἀρετάν IV 1 θεῶν = 43 Μοισᾶν; 2 Μέλισσ' = 44 Μελίσσ-; 3 see on III 3; 5 = 11 τέλος; 7 τιμάντ = 37 -τίμακεν; 10 ζωῶν = 22 φάμαν; 12 -εἰς = 42 αἰεῖ; 23 -ομένα = 47 -αμένα; 29 ἐρι- = 41 ἐπί; 32 ἰκέσθαι = 50 ἰδέσθαι; 34 ἀνδρῶν = 70 ἀνὴρ; 36 μομφάν = 54 ὄφρα; 38 κατὰ = 62 -ματα; 46 -βρεμε- = 64 τέκε; 47 ᾧ τ' ἄνα = 59 ἀθανά-; ἰσχει = 65 -ἴει; 55 Ἀλκμάνας = 61 Ἀλεκτρᾶν V 1 πολυ- = 22 πόλιν; 2 σέο = 23 θεο-; σέο γ' ἔκατ = 8 κλέος ἔπραξ-; ἔκατι = 29; 3 χρυσόν = 45 πύργος; 6 τιμάν = 54 τιμαῖ; 10 ποδῶν = 25 πόνων; 18 Φυλακίδα = 60 Φυλακίδαι; 22 -γομον = 28 χρόνον; 23 θεο- = 29 Διός; 24 κόμπων = 51 καύχαμ-; 29 Διός = 44 δια-; 33 γέρας . . ἐν Ἀργεῖ = 48 κελα- . . ἐν Ἀρει; 33 b Πολυ- = 48 b πόλις; 47 κείνων = 53 -εινῶν VI 1 ἀνδρῶν = 10 ἀνθρώ-; -ίου = 60; 2 μελέ = 61 Νεμέ-; 7 Φυλακίδα = 57 Φυλακίδαι; τρίτον = 32 ἴσον; 9 -φθόγγους = 34 -φθόγγου-; 12 ἐπήρατον = 37 κελήσατο; 15 αἰδαν = 31 -αμίαν; 28 -αχον ἐς = 62 -αγον ἐς VII 5 -αμένα = 22 ἀρετάν; 15 Πυθίους (Tricl.) = 49 Λοξία; 18 = 40 ὁ τι VIII 3 = 43 -έτω; 5 καίπερ = 25 παῖδες; λυθέντες = 15 τραφέντα; 7 κακῶν = 27 γαρῶν; 8 πόνον = 38 ποδῶν; 11 -μῆτον = 21 νῆσον; 13 πρὸ ποδός = 33 -ρον γόνον = 53 -οντό ποτ-; (σκοπεῖν Thiersch = 33 τεκεῖν); 15 -οισι = 45 -οισιν; 18 βασιλεί (Schmid) = 48 Ἀχιλλεύς; 25 ἀρίστευον = 65 ἐνίκασε; 29 ἔχεν (Schmid) = 69 -έχει (Tricl.); 30 θεῶν = 60 θεῶν; 34 κρέσσον = 54 Μείμων-; 35 λεχέων = 45 ἐπέων; 37 -ποδῶν = 47 σοφῶν; 41 = 50 πεδίον; 45 καρπός = 65 ἄβρον; 58 ἐπὶ = 68 Ἐπι-.

The list is nearly complete: I have no doubt that another inquirer, working over the same ground, will find something to strike out, something to add; it is hard to maintain the same standard in considering this matter, especially for the first time. Others must do the work over again.—I will remark that Pindar makes use of rhyme to bind his odes together. Thus it is easy to see how the last epode of the first Pythian is linked to the rest of the poem. Another case, where I will allow myself, for once, to consider a 'Bury-responson', is that of an ode which I choose simply because it is a favourite with me, the third Pythian. This beautiful poem is built up, in a mood of resignation, on the theme of 'lifting up,' either out of hell or out of affliction. The third verse, with its lovely cadence, strikes the note, ζῶνεν τὸν ἀποικόμενον, and this is echoed in 56 ἀνδρ' ἐκ θανάτου κομίσαι. ἀλκτῆρα νοσίων 7 is answered by ἔστασιν ὀρθούς 53, a motive repeated in 96 ἔστασαν ὀρθῶν (καρδίαν) and to this attention is directed by the rhyme with 80 ὀρθῶν ἐπίσταται.

Well, however one may use them in the details of interpretation, there the facts are, and I need not insist on them. Rhyme exists in Greek poetry: why? why does it exist in any poetry? Mezger's facts are no longer isolated: they fall into their place, and can no longer be explained away.¹ I amused myself, for a while, by using Mr. Cook's solvent—and some others, that occurred to me—on the rhymes in the fourth Pythian: they were eaten away, one by one. I made to myself, among other objections, that which most people would use (it is just like Wilamowitz' objection to the Attic archetype of Homer), that so many of these rhymes consisted merely of participial endings, and the like; things that must rhyme, anyhow, and must sometimes correspond. 'Must rhyme anyhow': well, out of what other material does rhyme arise? the language must have a tendency that way. And then, after playing the devil's advocate, I read my list once more and I was once more convinced. Why, I would not rate the evidence of the fourth Pythian as high as that of the twelfth Olympian, with its single rhyme. The facts exist: they can be, they must be, analysed more closely than I have done, they must receive fuller explanation: but they cannot be explained away.

Otto Schroeder (prolegomena II⁶⁴), who also has his theory of unconscious iteration to explain repetition at short distance, dismisses contemptuously the futilities of those who observe repetitions 'oculis potius quam auribus

¹ While contesting Mr. Cook's perhaps most important conclusion, I by no means wish to meddle with the general argument of his paper. But there is one poem I must rescue from his hands, Apuleius' *Ἀνεχόμενος* ex Menandro (anth. lat. II 4 ap. Baehrens PLM IV p. 104). If the assonances there are unconscious, then I expect someone to argue that the alliteration of *Clasped and clothed in the cloven clay* did not strike the poet's ear and that when he put *Nepheleidia* at the end of the *Heptalogia* he was seriously trying to show how the other six should have written. That poem of Apuleius does not belong to ancient literature at all; it stands among the beginnings of a new music; it foretells an invasion of rhyme from the end into the middle parts of the verse, a marination of the whole line in rhyme, assonance, and alliteration. This we may perceive in its primitive form here or in *Nor Mars his sword nor warres quick fire shall burne* or in the well-known *En robe d'or il adore* of Verlaine's *Parsifal* sonnet (exactly the *malas adorent ore* of Apuleius); more subtly in *Descendre à travers ma rêverie en silence* or *Las de l'amer repos où ma paresse offense* (where *paresse* stands to *repos*, for sound, as *Ἐλένα* to *νεφέλα* and is nearer in sense); it is this that gives all its terrible force to the word *mal* in the line *Similmente il mal seme d'Adamo*, which is hardly anything but veiled rhyme and assonance from the first syllable on.

aut fastidiosus atque insanus potius auribus quam graecis.' The 'Orakelton' of Wilamowitz is catching; but I am sceptical as to the possibility of anyone hearing Pindar 'graecis auribus.' Our memory is not, in these matters, that of the Greeks: we stand to them, I think, in the same relation as a layman to a musician, if both hear a new symphony for the first time. I conjecture that the recurrence of the same musical phrase would assist the perception of the rhyme. Else it were vain labour to rhyme the fourth Pythian.

BACCHYLIDES is taken off my hands by Blass. But the reader must be warned that he counts as rhyme every possible repetition, down to that of two consonants (*e.g.* γλ in fr. 20 as constructed by him vv. 1, 9). Thus, to look at his pages, you would imagine that you were being admitted to a 'revel of rhymes,' but it is quite otherwise: Bacchylides is true to himself nor is he extravagant. I will go through the *Theseus*, first, in order not to fill more space with examples, and secondly because Blass' method of notation makes my head turn when I try to check a longer ode. A few rhymes, which Blass has dropped, and which I found lying in my path without searching for them, are bracketed. 1 -άν = 16 -άν; 4 = 34 -άν; 5 -ός = 20 -ος; 6 (ὄρι' = 21 Κρονί-); ὄρ = 36 -ορ-; -ρι' = 51 -ρι; 9 -ων = 24 -ῶν-; -ων = 39 -ων; 10 -λας βίαι = 55 Λαμνίαν; (βίαι = 40 σθένος); 12 -τῶν = 57 -των; 15 = 60 -ας; 19 -όν τ' = 34 -οντ-; 21 -αίου = 51 -αίτου; 25 -(ρ)ων = 40 -(ρ)ῶν; 30 = 45 τελείται; 32 = 47 λέγει; 35 -ον σύν = 50 -ον κυν-; 38 = 53 καὶ . . -ον; 44 -τυ = 59 -τύ-. Brave rhymery, indeed! But, to be fair, let us take the first strophe of III, where things are slightly better. There faces you the very first word ἀριστοκάρπου printed thus Ἀριστὸκαρπον: the rhymes are made up thus 57 ἀπιστορον (why did not Blass space the first syllables?) 5 -το γὰρ (and he might have taken -ῶν from ναοῦ 19). 1 -ουσταν = 71 Μουσῶν; 2 = 5 -αν (where -δῖαν is spaced out, I find Ἰέρων in 64 92 but no -ος except the unspaced last syllable of ἀριστος 22).

There remain the fragments. For Pindar I simply follow Schroeder, for the others

Hiller-Crusius, not questioning their arrangement or reading.

PINDAR 107: 5 -υμένα = 14 -ομένα; 6 νεώ = 15 -νεώ; 8 Θήβαις = 17 θήσεις 122: 3 χλωρᾶς = 8 ὥρας 123: 2 δρακίς = 5 θράσει 124: 3 = 6 -ύσαια.

SIMONIDES 3 (Bergk 5) 1 γένεσθαι χαλεπὸν = 10 γένεσθαι δυνατὸν; 7 πράξας = 14 πάντας; 9 τοὺς κε θεοὶ φιλέωντι = 16 οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται 22 (Bergk 37) 1 πνέων = 10 -νέμων; 3 παρειαίς = 12 πρόσωπον. HYBRIS I need only mention.¹

I have searched stanzaic poetry for rhyme (which would be rhyme in our sense of the word) and have not found anything, in the classic period, which counts: for I do not suppose that one can lay much stress on Sappho I 21 διῶξει 22 δώσει or IV 1 ὕδωρ 2 ὕδων 3 φύλλον (Smyth retains ὕδων, which Wilamowitz *Homerische Untersuchungen* 315 had dismissed to the 'Rumpelkammer' along with ἀκοῖσαι and the like). But there exists one plain bit of evidence that, in the post-classic period, if not before, such rhyme was a recognized element of verse. No. 425 of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri runs thus:

ναῦται βυθοκυματοδρόμοι,
ἀλίων Τρίτωνες ὑδάτων,
καὶ Νειλῶται γλυκυδρόμοι
τὰ γελῶντα πλείοντες ὕδατα,
τὴν σύνκρισιν εἶπατε, φίλοι,
πελάγους καὶ Νείλου γονίμων.

γλυκυδρόμοι, I think, rather 'who speed amid the fresh waters,' as opposed to the ἀλίων Τρίτωνες ὑδάτων, than 'with happy course,' and this poet must also have meant by σύνκρισιν the 'meeting' or 'mingling' of the waters. What it all means, I cannot precisely say; but it is not my purpose to comment on this queer relic: I merely wish to point out that in the first four lines we have the common quatrain rhyme-scheme A B A B.

C. J. BRENNAN.

SYDNEY, August 1905.

¹ If Blass is right in making his fr. 4 of Bacchylides antistrophic, he might keep his one-syllable rhyme in 11 and at once fill the measure and explain the loss by inserting δαία before δάμναται. It is true that the word does not occur in our Bacchylides.

NOTES ON DEMETRIUS *περὶ ἑρμηνείας*.

4. THE cola of a sentence should not be very long, ἐπεὶ τοὶ γίγνεται ἄμετρος ἢ σύνθεσις ἢ δυσπαρακολούθητος.

As ἄμετρος here means only out of proportion, excessive in amount, we ought perhaps to read καὶ for ἢ. The two things go together and are almost one, not alternative.

15 τῶν δὲ τὰς πυκνὰς περιόδους λεγόντων οὐδ' αἱ κεφαλαὶ βραδίως ἑστᾶσιν . . οἱ τε ἀκούοντες ναυτιῶσι.

There seems no point in οὐδέ. Read οὐθ', which connects with the τε following, as in 19. Perpetual periods, he says, make both speakers dizzy and hearers sick.

25 (κῶλα) παρόμοια τοῖς ἐπ' ἀρχῆς (in respect of, by virtue of their beginning) . . ἢ ὥς ἐπὶ τέλους.

Radermacher's citations do not at all support this use of ὥς, for they all refer to something in the mind, while ὥς ἐπὶ τέλους here is purely objective and matter of fact. Perhaps ὥς, like ἦ in 4, is a mistake for καί, both confusions being well known.

66 ὥς Ἡρόδοτος ὀδράκοντες δὲ πον', φησίν, ἥσαν ἐν τῷ Κανκᾶσῳ μέγεθος, καὶ μέγεθος καὶ πλήθος.

The words (which he gives as an example of repetition, ἀναδίπλωσις) are not to be found in Herodotus, and as they stand they are not intelligible. The second difficulty is however easy to surmount. Probably the phrase intended was something like μέγεθος <θωμάσιοι>, καὶ μ. καὶ π. 'astonishing in size, both in size and in number.'

95 ποιεῖ δὲ μάλιστα μεγαλοπρέπειαν διὰ τὸ οἷον ψόφοις εἰκείναι, καὶ μάλιστα τῷ ξένῳ.

Is not the first μάλιστα an accidental repetition of the second?

103 ἔνα γὰρ μὴ ῥηθέντα μείζονα φαίνεται καὶ ὑπονοηθέντα μάλλον.

After the downright μὴ ῥηθέντα a μάλλον seems out of place. Perhaps we should read μόνον.

116 ὅταν διθυραμβώδης συντετῇ ἡ δίπλωσις τοῦ ὀνόματος. Perhaps διθυραμβώδως. Cf. 91 διθυραμβικῶς συγκείμενα. Such a mistake is common enough.

121 ἑρμηνέων ὅμοιον τῷ Τηλεβοᾷ ποταμῷ.

Probably ποταμόν. 'One like the river

Teleboas' is hardly possible for 'a river like the Teleboas.'

137 ὅταν τὸ αὐτὸ μηχανόμενον ἄχαρι γένηται.

As he means not 'has become' but 'becomes,' this should be γίνηται.

In 216 editors correct γινόμενα to γενόμενα.

143. He quotes from some poet unnamed

δέσποτα Πλούτων μελανοπτερίγων,
τοντι δεινὸν πρὸ πτερίγων
αὐτὸ ποιήσον.

πρὸ πτερίγων, which is of course metrically insufficient as well as difficult in meaning, may perhaps represent πρὸς τῶν πτερίγων, 'by thy (or their) wings I adjure thee.' For the apparently pointless αὐτό I would suggest the repetition of τοῦτο. τοντι shows the fragment to be due to a comic poet, or at least to a poet of little elevation.

158 ἔσται . . ἐμφαίνει.

Future and present together are unlikely. We might alter either.

164 τὸ δὲ γελοῖον καὶ <δι'> ὀνομάτων εὐτελῶν? Just above we have had ἐκφέρεται καὶ δι' ὀνομάτων καλῶν, and without διὰ the genitive lacks construction.

169 ἔνθα μὲν γὰρ γέλωτος τέχνη καὶ χαρίτων.

'Sometimes humour and grace go together.' This seems imperfectly expressed unless we add something, e.g. reading <καὶ> γέλωτος, or <ἅμα>.

So in 7 I think καὶ has been omitted before αἱ Λιταί.

222 συνετὸς ἑαυτῷ δοκεῖ διὰ τὸν ἀφορμὴν παρεσχηκότα αὐτῷ τοῦ συνείναι

τόν may be right, but I suspect it should be τήν. The construction is that of Thuc.

8. 76. 5 δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ προκαθημένους : 6. 80. 2 δι' ὑμᾶς μὴ συμμαχήσαντας : 5. 16. 1 : Dem. 18. 32 διὰ τούτους οὐχὶ πεισθέντας (τούς after τούτους not in Σ), etc.

226 φαίνεται seems a mistake for ἐφαίνετο. The sense needs that, and in the Platonic MSS. the word is ἔδοξεν.

237 καὶ <ἐπὶ> τοῦ Φαλαρίδους τοῦ τυράννου ἔφη τις, as in 218, 236, 285 (by Sauppe's restoration for ἐπεὶ), etc. The genitive, as in 164, needs a preposition.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

AD MUSONIUM RUFUM.

(C. Musonii Rufi reliquiae ed. O. HENSE. MCMV Lips. Teubn.)¹

Ob elegans hoc et perutile munusculum quantum editoris acumini industriae doctrinae debeamus, et statim insipienti non potest non occurrere et plene ubertimque expositum est a v. cl. P. Wendland (*Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift* 26 Jahrg. 1906, No. 7, pp. 197 sqq.); quod debitum, ut solvendo non sumus, ita optime agnoscere nobis videmur si quantulumcumque potuerimus ad emendationem libelli statum pro virili parte contribuemus.

Sect. II p. 6, 5 Πάντες, ἔφη, φύσει πεφύκαμεν οὕτως, ὥστε ζῆν ἀναμαρτήτως καὶ καλῶς, οὐχ ὁ μὲν ἡμῶν, ὁ δ' οὐ καὶ τούτου μέγα τεκμήριον ὅτι κτέ.

Praestare videtur <ὅτι> πάντες —, καὶ τοῦτο (sic F) μέγα τεκμήριον ὅτι κτέ., cf. p. 7, 8 καὶ μὴν κάκεινο μέγα τεκμήριον τοῦ μετεῖναι ἀρετῆς φύσει ἡμῖν κτέ. Conferatur adnotatio critica ad p. 99, 4.

Sect. VII p. 29, 16 προθυμότερους πονεῖν τοὺς τὰ κρείττω μετιόντας <ἢ> οἷς ἐλπίδες μακρὰ τῶν πόνων εἰσίν.

Propter Codicis Br¹ lectionem ἐλπίδες τῶν μακρῶν πόνων (sine ἦ) et Codicis A² superscriptionem μεγάλαι, olim scriptum fuisse suspicor ἐλπίδες μακρὰι (sine ἦ).

Sect. XVI p. 85, 7 οὐκ οὐκ ἀνέξη τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν μουσικοῖς, εἰς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἐπαίων μουσικῆς προστάτῃ κρούειν ἀμούςσως τὴν λύραν, ἢ ἐπιστάμενον γράμματα οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος κελεύῃ σε γράφειν καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν μὴ ὡς ἔμαθες, ἀλλ' ἐτέρως· οὐδέ γε ἂν ἐπιστάμενον κυβερνᾶν οὐκ ὦν κυβερνητικὸς κελεύῃ σε κινεῖν τὸ πηδάλιον ὡς οὐ προσήκει, οὐ προσέξεις αὐτῷ.

Quid potest esse evidentius quam genuinum esse id quod exhibet A²: ὦν μουσικός? Praeterea post προστάτῃ, quod in A correctum est, excidisse videtur <σοι>.

Sect. XVII p. 90, 6 ἐπεὶ μὴδ' ἐν θεοῖς μὴδὲν ὑπονοῆσαι κρείττον ἔχομεν φρονήσεως κτέ.

Aut omnia me fallunt aut 'cogitare' est ἐπινοῆσαι; cf. 12 τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἐπινοοῦμεν τὸν θεόν.

Sect. XVIII^A p. 98, 11 δεῖ γὰρ μηδαμῶς τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα δούλου μηδενὸς εἶναι μαλακώτερον.

μηδέν?

¹ Pagg. xxxvi et 148. Pret. Marc. 3. 20.

Sect. XVIII^B p. 100, 12 τοὺς ὀψοφάγους ἀντὶ ἀνθρώπων ὥσιν ἡ κυσὶν ὁμοιουμένους τὴν λαβρότητα κτέ.

Supplendum esse <διὰ> τὴν λαβρότητα et per se perspicuum est et ostendit locus e Clemente Alexandrino citatus.

Sect. XX p. 112, 16 τεκμήρια δὲ τούτων αἱ τῶν ἐφήβων ἐκεῖ (ἐν Λακεδαίμονι) καρτερήσεις, ἐπιζομένων φέρειν λιμὸν τε καὶ δίψας, καὶ μετὰ τούτων ῥίγος, ἔτι δὲ πληγὰς καὶ πόνοὺς ἄλλους . . . σεμνοῖς ἔθεσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τραφέντες ἀριστοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦσαν κτέ.

Aut ante σεμνοῖς excidit <ἐν οἷς>, aut in ipso latet; cf. p. 3, 2 οἱ μὲν ἐν ἔθεσι κρείττον, οἱ δὲ ἐν χεῖροσι τετραμμένοι.

Sect. XXIV p. 119, 9 Κἂν ἡδονῇ κανονιστέον ἢ τὰ ἀρεστά, οὐδὲν τῆς σωφροσύνης ἡδίων· κἂν πόνῳ κανονιστέον ἢ τὰ φευκτά, οὐδὲν τῆς ἀκραιψίας ἐπιπονώτερον.

De rebus expetendis et fugiendis, περὶ τῶν αἰρετῶν καὶ φευκτῶν, disputari solet inter philosophos.

Sect. XLV p. 128, 19 οὕτως καὶ Ῥούφος περὶ αὐτῶν με εἰώθει λέγειν 'συμβήσεται σοι τοῦτο καὶ τοῦτο ὑπὸ τοῦ δεσπότου.' κάμου πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποκρινάμενον ὅτι ἀνθρώπινα, 'τί οὖν' ἔφη 'ἐκεῖνον παρακαλῶ παρὰ σοῦ αὐτὰ λαβεῖν δυνάμενος;' τῷ γὰρ ὄντι, ὃ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τις ἔχει, περισσὸς καὶ μάταιος παρ' ἄλλου λαμβάνων.

Utinam editor, sicut in antecedenti fecerat sectione (p. 128, 1-7), ex Epicteto praemississet illa quibus conexa haec sunt: οὕτως καὶ —; quamquam ne sic quidem satis essent lucida. Solus Meibomius, παρακαλῇ scribens, locum intellexisse mihi videtur, in eo tamen errasse quod formam verbi *mediam* dedit, ab Epicteti genere dicendi abhorrentem. Scribatur itaque παρακαλεῖς. Obiter monendum est verbum *συμβήσεται* in bonam partem esse accipiendum, de quo haerebat Schweighäuser (Epict. ed. Schw. II. p. 140): conferatur Epict. iv 7, 21 (p. 370, 14 Schenkl).

Sect. XLVII p. 129, 15 Ῥούφος τις ἔλεγεν Γάλβα σφαγέντος ὅτι 'νὺν προνοία ὁ κόσμος διοικεῖται'; ὁ δὲ 'μὴ παρέργως ποτ' ἔφη, 'ἀπὸ Γάλβα κατεσκευάσατο, ὅτι προνοία ὁ κόσμος διοικεῖται.'

Corais coniecturam μὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ σοὶ ποτ' (cf. *Class. Rev.*, xx 1 p. 17) reiecit editor scholio fretus: ὡς ἔοικεν οὗτος οὐκ ἦν φιλόσοφος, ὃν ἐπιτραπίζει ὁ φιλόσοφος Ῥούφος λέγων

ὅτι παρέργως φιλοσοφεῖ· ἔδει γὰρ σέ φησι προηγουμένως κατασκευάζειν, ὅτι ἔστι πρόνοια καὶ μὴ ἀπὸ Γάλβα· ἐγὼ γὰρ τοῦτο φησιν οὐκ ἐποίησα: verum quidquid significat παρέργως—sive 'obiter' (Schweigh.) sive quid aliud—omne quod improbandi gratia additur adverbium inepte additur, ubi conclusionis pravitas (ἀπὸ Γάλβα κατασκευάσα) iam per ipsum hoc ἀπὸ Γάλβα denotatur; modo patria lingua veritas: videbis aut hoc aut illud ferri posse, non autem utrumque. Qui sic verba struere volet: μὴ παρέργως, ἀπὸ Γάλβα δηλονότι, κατασκευάσα; misere dilute responsionis concinnam et acutam brevitatem. Id persentiens scholiasta, ut tamen aliquo modo sese extricaret, in interpretatione sua παρέργως alio transtulit! huic tamen ignoscendum, siquidem verba illa 'ἵν' προνοία ὁ κόσμος διοικείται;' pro exclamazione, non pro interrogatione, ceperat, ut apparet ex hac scholii parte: ἔδει γὰρ σέ φησι προηγουμένως κατασκευάζειν, ὅτι ἔστι πρόνοια.

Typothetae errori tribuo, p. 7, 20 τοῦτ' οὖν τίνος ἄλλον τεκμήριόν ἐστιν ἢ τοῦ φυσικὴν εἶναι υποβολὴν τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ πρὸς καλοκάγαθίαν καὶ σπέρμα ἀρετῆς ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐνεῖναι. pro ἐνεῖναι;—p. 13, 16 ἀνθρώπους δὲ τοὺς ἀρρενας ἐξαίρετον τι ἄρα δεῖσθαι ἔχειν ἐν τῇ παιδείᾳ καὶ τροφῇ παρὰ τὰς θηλείας, pro θηλείας;—p. 21, 10 τί οὖν, (pro τί οὖν); εἶπεν ὁ Μουσώνιος, ταῦτα μὲν ταύτῃ ἔχει· cf. p. 10, 19 τί οὖν; ταῦτα μὲν ταύτῃ ἔχει· (= p. 85, 13).—p. 66, 10 οὐ γὰρ ἂν δόξαιεν εἶναι ἀνεκτόν, οὐ μόνον εἰ κεκτημένην ἄνδρα νόμιμον ἢ γυνῇ προσοῖτο δοῦλον, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ἀνανδρὸς οὕτω τοῦτο πράττει; pro πράττει.—p. 30, 1 ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἄρα θαυματοποιοὶ δύσκολα οὕτως ἐφίστανται πράγματα—ὦν τὸ σφάλμα θάνατός ἐστιν. καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ὁρῶσι

μικροῦ χάριν μισθοῦ· ἡμεῖς δ' οὐκ ἀνεξόμεθα ταιλαπωρεῖν κτέ. pro ἔστιν· καὶ ταῦτα πάντα—, qua interpunctione parenthesis clarius indicatur.—p. 59, 9 'τί δέ; ἐλευθεριώτερον αὐτὸν αὐτῷ μηχανᾶσθαι τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ἢ παρ' ἐτέρων λαμβάνειν;' utinam deorum immortalium ritu primi consilii non paenituisset editorem, v. cl. Elteri consilio haec interlocutori rursus adimentem (Addenda, p. 148); neque probro quod p. 89, 12 οὐδὲν οὖν οὕτως ζῆν ἂν λέγοιτο κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' ὁ τι ἂν μάλιστα τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐμφανίζῃ, δι' ὃν πράττει κατὰ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ φύσιν post πράττει leniter distingui vult, cum idem sit πράττειν κατὰ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ φύσιν quod alio loco (p. 93, 4) τὸ ζῆν κατὰ φύσιν ἢ χρῆ πράττειν καὶ διανοοῦμενον. Melius post ἐμφανίζῃ abesset distinctio.—p. 38, 8—p. 39, 2 demonstratur bonum regem necessario et esse philosophum, tum postea (p. 39, 2—p. 40, 7) philosophum esse regem; quo melius error praecaveatur, ultima verba sic distinguenda sunt: καὶ δὴ καὶ βασιλικὸς παραπλησίως τῷ κεκτημένῳ πολλοὺς ὑπάρχουσιν ὁ ἔχων ἓνα ἢ δύο τοὺς πειθόμενους αὐτῷ, μόνον ἐχέτω τὴν τοῦ βασιλευμένου ἐμπειρίαν· ὥστε καὶ βασιλικὸς εἴη ἂν (sc. ὁ φιλόσοφος). Haec (ὥστε καὶ κτέ.) idem valent quod logicorum illud 'Q. E. D.'

In epistula spuria p. 139, 6 πρὸς μὲν θεοὺς εὐσεβεῖα καὶ ὁσιότητι κοσμεῖσθαι, πρὸς ἀνθρώπους δὲ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ὁσιότητι rursus dormitavit typotheta denuo ὁσιότητα intrudens pro ὁσιότητι. Ibidem paulo infra (11) legitur τὸ μὲν αἰτεῖν ἢ μέμφεσθαι θάτερον αὐτῶν (τῶν γονέων) ἀσεβὲς ἡγείσθαι, κτέ.; quid hic sibi velit αἰτεῖν nescio: scio ἐγκαλεῖν et μέμψασθαι iungi solere.

A. J. KRONENBERG.

Rotterdam.

NOTES ON THE MOSTELLARIA OF PLAUTUS.

I. 662, 680.¹

TRANIO has told Theopropides that his son Philolaches had bought a house (637-658). Theopropides desires to know where this house is situate, but Tranio pretends that he cannot remember the name of the man from whom it was bought. In 662 Theopropides says *age, comminiscere ergo*. In *comminiscere* I see two senses, the innocent one which Theopropides himself intended, and the meaning of 'invent,' 'make up,' as one makes up a lie out of whole cloth. This latter sense is common in

¹ I use Lindsay's text.

Plautus; indeed, Professor Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, s. v., declares that the verb is used 'semper de fictis.' Cf. *Epid.* 281, *Mil.* 226, 232, *Capt.* 531, *Trin.* 516, *Asin.* 102, *Ps.* 689, 1206. Tranio, driven into a corner by his master's insistence, declares in an aside (662-667) that the best thing he can do is to say that Philolaches had bought the house next door. *calidum hercle esse audivi optimum mendacium*, 665, is an instructive commentary on 662. In 668 ff., in answer to an impatient *quid igitur? iam commentu's?* from Theopropides, Tranio asserts that Philolaches had bought the house next door. Theopropides expresses a desire

to inspect it; in 679, 680 he repeats his wish, thus: *evocadum aliquem ocus, roga circumducatur*. Could the audience help seeing a double meaning in *circumducatur*? In Plautus *circumducere* often = 'lead around by the nose,' 'cheat.' According to Lodge, the examples of this force fall into two classes. In the first we have *circumduco* with a personal accusative, as in *Asin.* 97, or in the passive, with personal subject, as in *Truc.* 874. In the second we have *circumduco* with the accusative of a person and the ablative of a thing, i.e. *circumducere* is treated as = *fraudare, privare*: see *Bac.* 311, 1183, *Poen.* 976, 1287, *Ps.* 431, 634, *Trin.* 859, 959. In *Ps.* 529 we have *ea* (= *fidicina*) *circumducam lepide lenonem*. In eleven passages, then, the meaning 'cheat,' 'cozen' is clear. The literal physical sense is found but thrice: here (combined, I believe, with the derived), *Most.* 843 (see below), *Mil.* 221 *anteveni aliqua et aliquo saltu circumducere exercitum*. This last passage is the clearest, and yet even there the reference is after all to cheating: cheating is described in a military figure.

Presently, *Tranio* calls on the neighbour that he may secure permission for *Theopropides* to inspect his house. In 714 ff. he cries: *Tempus nunc est senem hunc adloqui mihi. Hoc habet: repperi qui senem ducerem, quo dolo a me dolorem procul pellerem*. Here *ducerem* = *circumducerem*, 'cozen,' 'overreach.' When at last *Theopropides* meets the neighbour, the latter bids a slave show him through the house: *Eho, istum, puer, circumducere hasce aedis . . . ego met ductarem, nisi mi esset . . . negotium* (843, 844). Note carefully *Theopropides*'s reply: *Apage istum a me perductorem: nil moror ductarier. Quidquid est, errabo potius quam perductet quispiam*. Here he is awake at last, though at 662, 680 he had not seen the possibilities of his own language.

One remarks, of course, that when *Tranio* is finally brought to book by *Theopropides* he makes no use of this passage. He might well have defended himself by referring back to *Theopropides*'s imperatives in 662, 680, as affording justification for part at least of what he had done; if he chose to quibble, he had his master's express command to overreach that master. *Plautus*'s failure to use so effective a point does not, however, invalidate my suggestion. The *Mostellaria* is at once one of the most effective and one of the most impossible of *Plautus*'s plays. It has been remarked that *Tranio* makes no use of the information he gained by overhearing *Simo*'s

soliloquy in 690-710. The play opens with an effective scene between *Tranio* and *Grumio*, in which the latter, a slave from the country, upholder of proper living, comes off second best. *Plautus* might very easily and strikingly have made *Grumio* an instrument in the undoing of *Tranio* (cf. Professor *Fay*'s edition, p. 67), but he did not do so. In this respect *Plautus* failed, as *Terence* failed with his *πρόσωπον προτακόν* in the *Andria*, *Sosia*, though it may be argued that *Terence* had less chance to use *Sosia* than *Plautus* had to use *Grumio*; it is, further, possible for spectator or reader to assume that *Sosia* reported to *Simo extra fabulam*.

II. 832-852.

In his note on 850 Professor *Sonnenschein* said: 'but perhaps the fun of this passage consisted in having not a real dog, but the figure of a dog represented on the threshold, like that in the house of the Tragic Poet at Pompeii.' I agree with this note in believing that we are not to think of a real dog, but I do not believe that we are to think of a mosaic dog. The whole passage, and especially the words *tam placidast* (*canis*) *quam feta quaevis*, 852, certainly have more point if we hold there was no real animal present. *Theopropides* is by name (on the principle *κατ' ἀντίφασιν*) the man who sees nothing at all; *Tranio* in 495 says to him *interdum inepte stultus es!* *Tranio* is hoodwinking him here, as in 833-839 he had hoodwinked him when he invited him and *Simo* to look for a painting (non-existent) showing a cornix and two vulturi.

Now, there is no passage in *Plautus* or *Terence* in which there is a reference to mosaic work, and for good reasons. The evidence seems to show that mosaic work was not introduced into Greece until the third century B.C., and that it was not known in Rome until the time of Sulla.¹ With painting, however, the case is different. Verses 833-839 of the *Mostellaria*, already referred to, of themselves show that *Plautus* could refer to wall-paintings as to something entirely familiar to a Roman audience; the CAVE CANEM incident in *Petronius* 29 is also in point.

I have been at pains recently to collect all references in *Plautus* and *Terence* to painting. Cf. *Asin.* 174, 175 *neque fictum usquamst neque pictum neque scriptum in poematis ubi lena bene agat cum quiquam amante, quae frugi esse volt; 762-767 ne*

¹ See Mr. Cecil Smith in *Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities* ii. 397.

epistula quidem ulla sit in aedibus nec cerata adeo tabula; et si qua inutilis pictura sit, eam vendat: nū in quadriduo abalienarit quo apud te argentum acceperit, tuos arbitratus sit, comburas, si velis, ne illi sit cera ubi facere possit litteras (there may be a reference here to encaustic painting; this process was known to the Greeks by Alexander's time, i.e. before Menander's day¹); *Epid. 623-626 usque ab unguiculo ad capillum summumst festivissima. estne consimilis quasi quom signum pictum pulcre aspezeris? EP. e tuis verbis meum futurum corium pulcrum praedicas, quem Apella atque Zeuxis duo pingent pigmentis ulmeis; Capt. 998-1000 vidi ego multa saepe picta, quae Accherunti fierent cruciamenta, verum enim vero nulla adaeque est Accheruns atque ubi ego fui, in lapidicinis; Men. 143-145 dic mi, enumquam tu vidisti tabulam pictam in pariete ubi aquila Catameitum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum? PE. saepe. sed quid istae picturae ad me attinent? Merc. 313-315 si unquam vidistis pictum amatorem, em illic est. nam meo quidem animo vetulus, decrepitus senex tantidemst quasi sit signum pictum in pariete.* In *Poen. 1269* the ἀναγνώρισις has just taken place and Hanno has recovered his long lost daughters; here all three embrace afresh. Agorastocles *adulescens*, in love with one of the daughters, cries (1271-1273): *o Apella, o Zeuxis pictor, qui numero estis mortui, hoc exemplo ut pingeretis? nam alios pictores nil moror huiusmodi tractare exempla.* We may recall the story that Alexander the Great would have no one but Apelles paint his portrait. In *St. 270, 271* we have: *sed eccum Pinacium eius puerum. hoc vide, satine ut facete atque ex pictura astitit?* Mr. Fennell comments thus: 'So far from standing like a figure in a picture (an allusion to his name) Pinacium is more than half tipsy

¹ Smith, *D. of A.* ii. 392-394.

. . . so that he cannot stand steady, nor when he stops to rest does he at first know where he is.' Cf. also *Eun. 583-585 virgo in conclavi sedet suspectans tabulam quandam pictam: ibi inerat pictura haec, Iovem quo pacto Danae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem aureum.* *Vid. 35, 36* may also be cited: *mollitia urbana atque umbra corpus candidumst. NI. sol est ad eam rem pictor: atrum fecerit.* *Frag. 31 ff.* seems also to involve a reference to paintings: *nil quicquam factum nisi fabre nec quicquam positum sine loco; auro, ebore, argento, purpura, picturis, spoliis, tum statuis* Cf. also *Asin. 402 non potuit pictor rectius describere eius formam; Poen. 1114 formam quidem hercle verbis depinxit probe; Phorm. 268.* In *Mil. 1189* Pleusicles says of Palaestrio's plans, *satis placet pictura* (in 1177 ff. Palaestrio had described at length the *ornatus thalassicus* which Pleusicles was to wear).

The passages show that to the Romans of Plautus's day fresco painting and portrait painting were familiar. We may remember here that before Plautus's time Q. Fabius had been called Pictor.

One other point may be noted. In so far as the passages cited above throw any definite light on the subjects of paintings, we note that the themes all come from mythology: we have Venus and Adonis, Venus and Ganymede, Jupiter and Danae, and scenes in the underworld. Most of the wall-paintings at Pompeii are mythological in character; cf. e.g. *Mau-Kelsey Pompeii* 474, and the fine discussion in Boissier's *Rome and Pompeii*, as translated by Fisher, pp. 370-419.

CHARLES KNAPP.

[Mr. E. S. Thompson has already criticised Prof. Sonnenschein's interpretation in this *Review*, iv. p. 381. He suggests that the dog was a stuffed one.—Ed. C.R.]

ON THE SINGING OF TIGELLIUS (HORACE, *SAT.* I. iii. 7, 8).

TIGELLIUS, according to Horace's account, as it is usually printed in our editions, used to sing

modo summa
voce, modo hac resonat quae chordis quatuor ima.

In dealing with this passage all our editors, so far as I know, have accepted an interpretation which may be said to have become traditional. The poet, they explain, is here speaking in the technical language of Greek music, in which the 'uppermost' string of

the lyre (*ὑπάρη χορδή*) was the one of lowest pitch, while the lowest (called *νήρη*) gave the highest note; accordingly *summa voce* here means 'in a deep bass voice,' and *quae chordis quattuor ima resonat* is a high treble. So far all agree. But when they come to the elucidation of details, it quickly appears from their doubts and divergent views that the matter is by no means so clear as their unanimity on the main issue would lead us to expect. There are in fact, serious difficulties in the way of the traditional interpretation, which demand a more careful examination than they have apparently yet received.

(1) The first and most obvious of these difficulties lies in the fact that *summa voce* had in current usage a meaning just the reverse of the one we seek to attach to it here. The Roman, like the Greek, conception of 'high' and 'low' notes, of 'up' and 'down' the musical scale, was the same as ours. This fact might perhaps be safely taken for granted, the conception is so natural; but there is proof within easy reach. For example Cicero (*De Oratore* 3. 227), after recalling the employment of a *fistula* by Gracchus to control the pitch of his voice, goes on as follows: 'In omni voce, inquit Crassus, est quiddam medium, sed sum cuique voci; hinc gradatim ascendere vocem utile et suave est. Nam a principio clamare agreste quiddam ist, et idem illud ad firmandum est vocem salutare. Deinde est quiddam contentionis extremum, quod tamen interius est quam acutissimus clamor, quo te fistula progredi non sinet et iam ab ipsa contentione revocabit. Est item contra quiddam in remissione gravissimum, quoque, tamquam sonorum gradibus descenditur.' And Quintilian, in an equally instructive passage (11. 3. 41, 42), writes: 'Neque gravissimus autem in musica sonus nec acutissimus orationibus convenit. . . Nam vox, ut nervi, quo remissior, hoc gravior et plenior; quo tensior, hoc tenuis et acuta magis est. Sic ima vim non habet, summa rumpi periclitatur. Mediis ergo utendum sonis.' From these passages it is plain that *summa voce* means *acutissima voce*. If Horace, intending to use a contrary terminology, began his sentence with *modo summa voce*, he defeated his own purpose by misleading his reader at the outset.

Did Horace write *summa voce*? I am not

calling in question the soundness of the text but the correctness of our punctuation. There is something to be said for a different division of the sentence, suggested by rhythm and emphasis. The two superlatives are placed where they stand, of course, for more emphatic contrast; and in reading the lines the emphatic *summa* holds our attention and our voice for a moment, appreciably strengthening the metrical pause at the close of the verse; whereas there is no metrical reason for a pause after *voce*, which is metrically more closely connected with *hac* than with *summa*. According to these indications this is what Horace meant to say:

modo summa,
voce modo hac resonat quae chordis
quattuor ima.

The position of *modo*, in both sentence and verse, will then be the same as in 9. 9:

ire modo ocius, interdum consistere;

and *summa* is not *summā* (sc. *voce*), but nominative, with its construction held in suspense until it is supplied in the words that accompany *ima*: that is to say, *modo summa* stands for *modo (illa) voce quae chordis quattuor resonat summa*. If anyone thinks the separation of *summa* from *voce* harsh and the ellipsis too bold, he can satisfy himself that Horace is quite capable of both by reading the next few lines:

saepe velut qui
currebat fugiens hostem, persaepe velut qui
Iunonis sacra ferret;

where *qui* is not the subject of *currebat*, which is thrust parenthetically into the first relative clause, usurping the place of its proper verb, *curreret*, of which we get no definite clue till we come to *ferret* at the end of the second relative clause. The ellipsis is certainly bold, but it is quite in Horace's manner. When his sentence contains two parallel or contrasted members having a common construction, he is fond of reserving a part or the whole of the common matter for the second member. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this practice:

C. 1. 12. 26.

hunc equis, illum superare pugnīs
nobilem.

E. 2. 3. 189.

neve minor neu sit quinto productior actu.

S. 1. 4. 115.

sapiens, vitatu quidque petitu
sit melius, causas reddet tibi.

E. 2. 1. 24.

foedera regum
vel Gabiis vel cum rigidis aequata Sabinis.

C. 1. 8. 11.

saepe disco,
saepe trans finem iaculo nobilis expedito.

In the light of these and similar examples we can see that Horace may have intended to divide the sentence before us in the way suggested, so as to hold the meaning of *summa* in suspense till it can share with *ima* the reference to the tetrachord; and this division would effectually eliminate the difficulty we have been considering. But before deciding to move our comma for that reason, it will be prudent to examine further and see whether, even with this obstacle removed, the traditional interpretation of the passage can stand. For there are other difficulties, which I will now endeavour to state.

(2) If *summa* and *ima* get their meaning from the Greek musical vocabulary, they designate, in this context, the lowest and the highest note of a single tetrachord. Now these two notes are separated by an interval of only two and a half tones, or about half an octave,—an utterly inadequate range of pitch to express the extremes that Horace obviously has in mind.

(3) The traditional interpretation rests on the assumption that *ὑπάτη* and *νήτη*, which *summa* and *ima* are supposed to represent, are the extreme notes of the tetrachord. As a matter of fact the two names do not both occur in any tetrachord. The nearest they come to one another is in the part of scale corresponding to the old heptachord, in which they apparently originated; at any rate the names were given to the outside strings of that instrument, and to the corresponding notes. The heptachord consisted of two 'conjunct' tetrachords, that is of two tetrachords having the middle string or note (*μέση*) in common. The names were likewise given to the outside notes of the octachord, which consisted of two 'disjunct' tetrachords, so that here they were a whole octave apart. Even this interval would be hardly enough for Horace's purpose, and it is of course excluded by *chordis quattuor*. In the more extended musical scale, which the poet must have had in mind, *ὑπάτη* and *νήτη* occur twice each as the names of notes,

and the lowest note of all is not named *ὑπάτη*.

(4) The traditional interpretation requires us to suppose either that *summa* and *ima* had become established by usage as the Latin equivalents of *ὑπάτη* and *νήτη*, or that they were such apt translations of those terms as to be readily recognized as their equivalents by the poet's readers. Neither of these suppositions appears to be tenable. There was no such established usage. The first Latin treatise on music, the seventh book of Varro's *Disciplinae*, had probably not been published when Horace wrote this satire; and in any event it appears that Varro did not establish a Latin nomenclature for the musical notes. For Vitruvius, who knew Varro's work, says (5. 4. 1) that many of the terms had no Latin equivalents, and he therefore transcribes the Greek forms (*hypate*, *nete*, etc.). Later we find Latin terms established, but those for *ὑπάτη* and *νήτη* are not *summa* and *ima*, but *principalis* and *ultima* (Martianus Capella 9. 942 f.; Boethius, *De Musica* 4. 3). As to aptness of translation, *ima* could hardly be recognized as standing for *νήτη* (= *νέστη*), which properly means, not 'lowest,' but 'last,' and was rightly rendered in the *ultima* of later writers. In the case of *ὑπάτη* translation was difficult, because it was uncertain in which of its various phases of meaning the word was used. The usual explanation is that the name was originally given to the string of lowest pitch because that string was uppermost in position as the lyre was held in playing. This explanation appears to have come from an ancient source: at least we find it in the confused comments of the later scholiasts, though not in Porphyrio. But even so it was merely an ancient opinion, one of several that were current. We must remember that the names of the musical notes were in Horace's time, centuries old, so that their original significance, so far as it had no bearing on their present use, must have long since faded away. This is apparent in the Greek writers on music, from Aristoxenus down, to whom they are as colourless as 'scale' and 'key' and 'treble' are to us. Thus *ὑπάτη* had come to be a mere name of a note. Why it had been originally applied to that note, nobody knew, anybody was at liberty to guess. Some of the Pythagoreans found its origin in their doctrine of the music of the spheres: the gravest note was called *ὑπάτη*, because it is the note of Saturn, the highest of the seven heavenly spheres, while the most acute, as that of the moon, the lowest and last

of the series, was for a similar reason called *νήρη* (Nichomachus, page 6 Meybom). But other Pythagoreans refuted this etymological theory, pointing out that under the physical conditions just the reverse must be true: the moon, the slowest of the heavenly orbs, must produce the dullest note, and Saturn, the swiftest, or rather the still swifter starry sphere above Saturn, must yield the most acute (Nichomachus, p. 33 f.; cf. Cicero, *Somnium Scipionis* 10, and Macrobius, *Commentary* 2. 4). Aristides Quintilianus has a simpler explanation: *ἑπάρη* and *νήρη* signified in archaic usage merely 'first' and 'last' (1. 6, pp. 10, 11). Still another view of the meaning of *ἑπάρη* has left its record in the Latin translation *principalis*, mentioned above. On the whole it appears that the translation of the two Greek terms was no simple matter, and that Horace had by no means the sure ground to go upon that he needed in using *summa* and *ima*, with their meanings reversed, for that purpose.

I see no way of maintaining our traditional interpretation in the face of these difficulties; and as these all have their root in the intrusion into the sentence of the Greek technical terms in their supposed *etymological meanings*, one is prompted to inquire whether the poet was really guilty of such pedantry,—whether we cannot find in the proper sense of his words a more satisfactory expression of his obvious meaning, without resorting to the Greek at all. This, so far as *summa* and *ima* are concerned, would be a return to the ancient interpretation; for our modern interpretation, though it has now become traditional, does not go back to the scholiasts, who mention the Greek technical terms, but not as affecting the meaning of the Latin adjectives. The Pseudacro and the Commentator Cruquianus fall into some confusion over the Greek terms, but they both define *summa* as equivalent to *acutissima*. Porphyrio is perfectly clear. He paraphrases the passage thus: *modo clara voce modo pressa*; and adds: *et a tetrachordo hoc ('the latter') sumptum, in quo est gravissimi soni chorda quae hypate dicitur*. He thus associates *hypate* directly with *ima*, and evidently has no thought of its etymological meaning.

The question of interpretation turns upon the meaning of *voce*, and on the construction and meaning of *chordis quattuor*. The latter is usually explained as an ablative ('on the four strings'), *voce* being used here for musical note, either vocal or instrumental. It is true that *vox* is often used of instru-

mental music, but in this use it is still a conscious figure of speech; and because we may speak of 'the voice of the lyre,' it does not follow that we may say a man sings with the voice of the lyre. The *vox* with which Tigellius sang was his own voice, which might be attuned to a given string, but was not sounded upon it. *Chordis* is therefore dative, with the construction aptly illustrated in the passage cited by Krueger from Cicero, *Tusc.* 3. 3: '(gloria) virtuti resonat tamquam imago.' The voice 'echoes' the strings.

The tetrachord, paraphrased in *chordis quattuor*, we are to think of, not as a species of lyre, but as a part of the musical scale, without specification of any particular instrument. It was a system of four notes, of which the two exterior were fixed, and the two interior movable, varying in their positions and intervals according to the kind of scale. We do not need for our present purpose to go into the matter further than to observe two things: first, that the tetrachord was not a mere convenient subdivision of the musical scale, but a complex organic unit, so that the scale took the form of a group of tetrachords rather than of a series of individual notes; and, secondly, that the most obvious difference between any two tetrachords was a difference of pitch. The more extended musical scale consisted of one unattached note at the bottom, and four tetrachords.

In view of these facts, what are we to understand when we are told that a voice in singing echoes or responds to four strings? Evidently that the singer reproduces vocally the notes of a tetrachord as sounded on some stringed instrument, and—which is the main point here—keeps within that range of pitch. The voice that 'responds with lowest pitch (*ima*) to a tetrachord' is, strictly speaking, one that keeps within the range of the lowest tetrachord; or, as we might say less formally, within the lowest quarter of the scale. In like manner a man who sings *voce quae chordis quattuor resonat summa* keeps within the highest quarter; in other words, sings *summa voce*. Thus Horace expresses the extremes of pitch in which Tigellius indulged, not by single notes, but by ranges of notes: which is more appropriate, for Tigellius certainly did not confine himself to a single note at either extreme.

The question how Horace intended to divide his sentence I shall not undertake to decide. Both forms express his meaning, and express it about equally well. Division

after *summa* makes a more symmetrical sentence, but symmetry does not count for much in these studiously informal *sermones*.

There is ancient tradition, represented by Porphyrio, in favour of *summā voce*.

CLEMENT L. SMITH.

REVIEWS.

WILAMOWITZ AND OTHERS ON THE GREEK AND ROMAN WORLD.

Die Kultur der Gegenwart, ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele: Teil i, Abteilung viii, *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache*. VON U. von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, K. KRUMBACHER, J. WACKERNAGEL, FR. LEO, E. NOEDEN, F. SKUTSCH. Berlin and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1905. 8vo. Pp. 464 (including index and short bibliography). Price M. 10, geb. M. 12.

THE present volume is the eighth of an encyclopaedic work on the history and tendencies of civilisation. Some parts of the volume, especially the sections on the languages themselves, seem carefully to avoid presupposing any knowledge of the languages which they treat of. *ὁ βασιλεύς* for instance is written in Italian characters with a German translation, but the book will doubtless be read principally by classical students. Its design, however, is not to serve as a compendious manual of facts, but rather to be a brief critical appreciation of the two literatures and languages, to give the ordinary student the most modern views and estimates of the various epochs of Greek and Latin literature and of the principal Greek and Latin authors, and to correct the false perspective in which the student of the *Schulautoren* often regards the whole subject. A book written with this purpose must above all things be illuminating. It must on every page answer the question why the modern *Gebildeter* should read the author or the language of which it treats. On the whole it may be claimed for the book that it realises this object. It is divided into six sections, which treat of Ancient Greek Literature, Mediaeval and Modern Greek Literature, and the Greek Language, and the three corresponding topics in Latin. The significance for modern times of the successive literary periods and their continuous organic development is well brought out, and there are brief but often most suggestive accounts of

all the principal Greek and Roman writers. It is interesting to note the amount of space assigned to the various periods, for the whole scheme of the work shows that the amount of space assigned to any period is to be the index of its importance.

Ancient Greek Literature is dealt with by von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in 236 pages out of the 451 of the whole book. Of these 236 pages only 46 are devoted to the great Attic period. The comparatively lengthy treatment which early Christian literature receives is justified by the title of the general work (*die Kultur der Gegenwart*), but it is somewhat paradoxical to devote, as Wilamowitz does, considerably more space (60 pages) to Hellenistic literature than is granted to Attic, although all that is said about the period is most interesting. This preferential treatment is described by the author himself as a protest against 'the orthodox unfairness.' The fact, however, that this literature has failed to survive—a fact which, when reading Wilamowitz on Cleitarchus or Duris for example, one is apt to forget—is surely a reason for treating it a little less fully in '*Die Kultur der Gegenwart*.' As regards details of treatment, it is hard to single out anything in particular, where nearly everything is treated so suggestively. Perhaps the best parts of this section are those dealing with those authors who diverge most widely from the moderns either in form or style. For example, the peculiar social and literary conditions under which Sappho and Pindar wrote are happily brought out in a few lines which give more insight into their characters and spirits than many whole commentaries and elaborate introductions. The account of the rise of the drama is not quite up to the level of the rest. It gives if anything too much prominence to the technical details of the Attic stage. The paragraph, however, which traces the influence of the drama on the Platonic dialogue, and that again in which the Platonic dialogue is shown to have had its logical

outcome in the Aristotelian treatise are excellent examples of the way in which Greek and Latin literature is shown to be one complex but organic growth.

Any lucid epitome of mediaeval Greek literature would probably be read with the interest of novelty by the average English scholar, and Krumbacher's section on this subject is more than merely lucid. He writes with a most lively belief in the importance of his subject for the modern world at large. His conception of the mission of modern Greek as being to spread humanism and Christian civilisation over the East may be somewhat enthusiastic, as may also be his estimate of some of his favourite Byzantine authors, for example the sixth century Christian hymn writer Romanus, although it must be confessed that the two stanzas that he quotes make the reader want to hear more; but the whole section is a suggestive study of one phase of the struggle between East and West, conservatism and progress. The modern application often lies startlingly near. Krumbacher wants modern Greek to start a new life by developing on the lines of the Romance languages. He can only find a parallel for the literary conservatism of the modern Greek in that of the Turks and Chinese.

The section on the Greek language is less satisfactory. This is not so much the fault of the writer as of the subject. It is hard to see how a better popular history of the Greek language from its birth to the present day could have been written in the 24 pages allotted to this subject. The mistake seems to have been rather in giving the language a separate section. The writer, or rather the subject, of the last section of the book (die lateinische Sprache) is open to the same criticism.

Friedrich Leo's section on Classical Latin Literature is a clear and dispassionate résumé of the subject, though occasionally the treatment of well known writers or epochs is lacking in interpretive power. We are told, for instance, that the ancients had not the modern ideas about plagiarism, but no attempt is made to explain the spirit in which they plagiarised. Again we are told that Homer's games are a collection of interesting but disconnected incidents, whereas the various athletic events described in the fifth Aeneid form an artistic whole with a dramatic dénouement, but no explanation is offered as to why Virgil made this variation from his original, though every reader will feel that it illustrates some fundamental difference between the two poets. It is a pity too that Leo

gives support to the common view that it is chiefly Lucretius' 'digressions' that make him a poet, and that the atomic theory is fundamentally unpoetical. He means doubtless that it is wanting in human interest. But it is surely a lack of imagination not to see that the atomic theory as regarded by Lucretius is essentially the same theme as that of Dante and Milton. If once we put ourselves in Lucretius' position—and it is not the poet's fault that we fail to do so—every line of the poem has an intensely personal interest. The idea that the poem contains digressions and purple patches is at once dispelled. It is possible to appreciate Iphigeneia without doing this, but Iphigeneia and the other 'digressions' lose as much by being detached from the *Natura Rerum* as would Beatrice by being removed from the Divine Comedy.

The period of transition from classical times to the middle ages is dealt with by Eduard Norden. His introductory remarks, which he heads 'Hellenismus, Christianismus, Nationalität,' will be found most helpful towards a true appreciation of the period. Method of treatment is perhaps of more importance in this than in any other section, and the topographical arrangement which the writer adopts has much to recommend it. The notices of individual writers give rise to frequent but always relevant digressions on such subjects as rhyme and the beginnings of modern poetry (Ambrosius), Benedictine monasticism (Cassiodorus), the debt that Christian philosophy owes to Plato (Augustin). Although the writer of this section does not profess to go beyond the times of Charlemagne, he deliberately continues his account down to the times of Petrarch. Till then Latin was a living language. It was Petrarch and his successors who dealt it its death-blow, not by the services that they rendered to Italian and the other Romance languages, but by the false classicism of the Latin that they wrote, with its attempted return to the language of Cicero and Virgil.

One practical point that the whole book suggests is worth raising. Ought we not in England to extend our curricula, at least in the seats of higher education? Is it desirable that our university students (and lecturers?) should practically never read anything written in Greek after Theocritus, or in Latin after Tacitus? Though the other contributors to the present work do not attack the 'Schulautoren' curriculum so openly and vigorously as Wilamowitz, yet

the whole tone of the book is in favour of reading a wider selection of authors, and the book itself would serve as an excellent director of studies to those who wish to do so.

All the more striking therefore is its condemnation of Demosthenes and Cicero as authors for reading in schools. The foul moral atmosphere that Wilamowitz breathes when reading Demosthenes probably does little harm to the average schoolboy, but it is often forgotten how deadly dull it almost inevitably is to read twice a week for month after month one or two pages of any of the longer orations of either Demosthenes or Cicero. Every prose book of course loses by this method of reading, but it is nevertheless true that, for teaching purposes, with a historical or philosophical book a few prefa-

tory remarks are all that are needed, and the book has then only to be read consecutively for every succeeding chapter or section to form a natural unit of interest. This is not the case with the speeches of the two orators. Units of interest of the requisite length for a single lesson or lecture are only to be found here and there, and nearly every one of them requires a separate historical introduction. If, however, a series of extracts were carefully made, and were read in chronological order, one at each lesson, after an appropriate explanation of the historical setting, might not Cicero and Demosthenes prove to be not a cause of corruption to our youth, but the best introduction to two of the most difficult periods of ancient history?

PERCY URE.

TACCONE'S THE IAMBIC TRIMETER IN GREEK.¹

THIS large pamphlet (80 tall pages) consists chiefly of classifications, in which the various possible types of trimeter are distinguished according to the nature and order of the six feet, and each type is exemplified, if it occurs, from (1) the *iambographi*, (2) Aeschylus, (3) Sophocles, (4) Euripides (tragedy), (5) the *Cyclops*, (6) Aristophanes. Thus on p. 53 it is said that 'a dactyl in the first place with a tribrach in the third' is not found before Sophocles, nor in the *Cyclops*, but examples are cited from Sophocles, Euripidean tragedy, and Aristophanes. The author does not give statistics, and there is often no indication of frequency or rarity, for want of which an inexperienced reader might well sometimes misapprehend the real state of the case. The examples given are for the most part valid, though there are errors, some of them rather startling, as for instance, when *πάρεστιν οὐδὲν τερπνὸν οὐδ' ἐράσιμον* (Semonides) is cited (p. 10) as a pure iambic, or when Eur. *Bacch.* 1274 *σπαρτῶ μ' ἔδωκας, ὡς λέγονσ'*, *Ἐχίονι* is said (p. 6) to exhibit elision preceding a final *cretic*. The collections, however, as far as they go, are interesting and may be turned to account.

But the work is no complete account of the subject; and when the author passes occasionally to the deduction

of rules, and to the critical application of them, it becomes evident that his grasp, possibly for want of actual practice in composition, is neither comprehensive nor sure. For example (p. 26), it is true that in *Iph. Aul.* 1570 *ἔλεξε δ', ὃ θηροκτόν' Ἀρ-τεμι παῖ | Διός*,² the anapaest is placed badly and not according to the practice of Euripides; but we cannot cure this by writing *ἔλεξε δ', ὃ θηροκτόνε Δι-ὸς Ἀρτεμι*, which violates the general rule for the division of a tribrach, as stated by the author himself on p. 17. Nor need we be at the pains to correct the verse at all. This part of the play, completed after the death of Euripides by quite incompetent hands, swarms with metrical and other errors, and is not to be brought to the standard of Euripides himself. If it were, we should not be content to mend v. 1610 *ἀπροσδόκητα δὲ βροτοῖσι τὰ τῶν θεῶν*, cited on the same page, by writing *βροτοῖς*, and leaving untouched the feeble caesura combined with the weak and precarious lengthening of *δέ* before *βρ* in the next word. A composer, for whom this and other such things were good enough, may well have written *βροτοῖσι τὰ τῶν θεῶν* too. On the other hand, *Iph. Aul.* 652 *οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι φῆς, οὐκ οἶδα, φίλτατ' ἐμοὶ πάτερ* (see same page) comes from a scene which must have been written, if not by Euripides, by some one who had appropriated his art to perfection. The verse, irregular as it is, is almost certainly by the

¹ *Il Trimetro Giambico nella Poesia Greca. Memoria di Angelo Taccone. Accademia Reale delle Scienze di Torino: Torino, Carlo Clausen, 1904.*

² So cited by the author, but see the MSS.

original hand, and is extremely interesting. The dramatist, exhibiting a simple girl, almost a child, who speaks in some bewilderment to her father, adopts deliberately, for a moment, the familiarity and careless movement which are regular in comedy. All the symptoms of the later Euripidean tragedy point to such a device as the next possible and likely step in artistic development, a step on the road to Menander. Here Euripides, or his excellent imitator, actually takes that step. And if we insist on regularizing the metre, we must hardly do it, as the author proposes, at the expense of the language, thus: οὐκ οἶδ' ἂν φῆς, οὐκ οἶδα, φίλτατος πᾶτερ.

The rule on the 'cretic pause' is stated (p. 5) thus: 'When a tragic trimeter ends with a word or a group of words making up a foot and a half (= an apparent cretic), the preceding syllable is short. With elision (between this syllable and the cretic), it may be long.' A composer, who tried by this rule to follow the tragedians, would make strange work. He must suppose that such a verse as ὁ δ' ὡς τάχιστα τοῦτ' ἐσήμην' ὄμμασιν would be common and regular, but that such as χραίνει σταλαγμοῖς ἱππικῶν ἐκ πνευμόνων (Aesch.), εἴ τοί σφε τιμᾶς ἐξ ἴσου τῷ δυσσεβεῖ (Soph.), λύνει βροτοῖσιν ἡ γαμὲν οὐκ ἄξιον (Eur.) are irregular, as indeed the author declares. As a fact, the first verse breaks rather violently, and the three others do not infringe at all, the true rule, which is, that the two long syllables must not be separated by any noticeable pause. The reason, which is seldom stated properly, is this. In the latter part of a rhythmical series, licences of any kind are liable to offend, because the close must necessarily dwell on the ear. For this reason the last foot of the trimeter is always a true iambus; and for the same reason, a pseudo-spondee in the penultimate foot is in itself a somewhat bold variation, though it has certain compensating advantages. But the offence is aggravated, with-

out any compensation, if between the two syllables of the pseudo-spondee there is any perceptible pause; because in that case the thesis of the foot, which ought to be short, is really longer than the arsis, for the thesis consists in effect of the first long syllable plus the pause. In applying the rule, if the two syllables are separated at all (which is unusual) many delicate questions arise as to what amount of pause is, in the circumstances, noticeable. It is easily decided that the pause in ἐκ πνευμόνων, or in οὐκ ἄξιον, is not noticeable, the phrases being as solid as a single word; and such combinations are in fact so common that they must be embraced in the rule. But will this do?

διώμσοι πλέουσιν, ἦ | μὴν ἦ | λόγῳ
πίσαντες ἄξιν, ἦ πρὸς ἰσχίος κράτος.

One might hesitate: ἦ adheres rather closely to λόγῳ, and μὴν is hardly separable from ἦ. We cannot therefore say that between μὴν and ἦ we do not perceive any break. Sophocles however decides (*Phil.* 592) that the stretch, as a rare variety, is tolerable. He goes even a little farther, and beyond any formal justification, in *Phil.* 22:

ἂ μοι προσελθὼν σῖγα σήμαιν' εἴτ' ἔχει . . .

Here the elision between σήμαινε and εἴτε, which according to our author (p. 6) brings the case simply within rule, has probably some little effect; that is to say, τηρῶν εἴτ' ἔχει (for example) would be more irregular still. Something depends on the partition between εἴτ' and ἔχει, slight as it is; σήμαιν' εἰθέως would be decidedly worse. Something should probably be allowed (see Jebb *ad loc.*) for an emphasis on the first syllable of σήμαιν(ε), leaving the second syllable comparatively short. But when all is said, 'the words break the metrical rule' (Jebb). We must miss both rule and reason, if we begin our exposition, as the author does, by treating such an eccentricity as normal.

A. W. VERRALL.

CONYBEARE'S AND STOCK'S SELECTIONS FROM THE LXX.

Selections from the Septuagint. By F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A., and ST. GEORGE STOCK, M.A. Boston: Ginnett and Co. 1906. Pp. v + 313. Price 7s. 6d.

THIS is a volume to be welcomed with heartiness and sincerity. The fact that it

belongs to the 'College' series of Greek Authors issued by a well-known American publishing firm, is another point in its favour. It is high time that students should enlarge their literary outlook, realize that Attic Greek is not everything, and disabuse their minds that Greek literature came to

some mysteriously sudden close after Theocritus. Now there is no book quite comparable to the Septuagint, for the purpose of hammering home these truisms. Apart, too, from its great literary importance, as being written in the *koivē* of Alexandria any time after the middle of the 3rd century B.C., the Septuagint has other (perhaps higher) claims on the interest of thoughtful persons. There is something more than a literary importance attaching to this (in some ways) greatest, as it is the first, of all translations of the Bible; and true criticism can never exhaust itself by any mere literary handling of its text. What the Vulgate has been, and is, to the West, that the Septuagint has been, and is, to the East. But more: the writers of the N.T., in almost all cases, appeal to the LXX version for confirmation of doctrine or historical declaration; and even before the Christian era it had acquired for itself the position of an inspired book. Messrs. Conybeare and Stock are well within the mark when (*Introd.* p. 20) they imply that the LXX version has exercised a world-influence. This fact alone would make it amply worth our while to study it, now and then, and reflect upon the signal position it occupies in the development of human history.

Hitherto no annotated edition of any portion of the LXX has been available for students; and, until quite recently, the aids to Septuagint study have been singularly meagre. But the publication of Dr. Swete's manual edition some few years back, followed—first by Hatch and Redpath's noble Concordance, secondly by Swete's Introduction, and lastly by the publication (early this year) of the first fascicle of the new Cambridge edition of the text, with an elaborate critical apparatus: all these aids, I say, have rendered it possible to approach the study of

the LXX with a sense of confidence and comfort unknown a generation ago.

Briefly, the aim of Messrs. Conybeare and Stock in their pioneer work is to render available for students selected portions of the LXX, so annotated as to give them a clear insight into the main peculiarities of vocabulary and style. With this excellent object in view they have chosen seven sections: (1) The Story of Joseph; (2) The Story of the Exodus; (3) The Story of Balaam and Balak; (4) The Story of Samson; (5) The Story of David and Goliath; (6) The Story of Elijah; (7) The Story of Hezekiah and Sennacherib. Each section is prefaced by short introductory remarks (these are, perhaps, the least convincing portions of the book); there is a fair abundance of linguistic notes at the foot of the printed text; there is a general introduction to the study of the LXX; and last, not least, a short grammar of LXX Greek. This portion of the work is excellent, and the writers deserve our thanks for their very careful conspectus. The General Introduction (pp. 1-24) is, perhaps, rather thin, but gives a fair and lucid account, on the whole, of the literary problem of the origin of the Septuagint. Few readers will be disposed to contest their general conclusions (*e.g.* as to the non-historical character of the Story of the '72'); but here and there a conjecture as to date or authorship seems to be based on too slender evidence (for an example, see *Introd.* p. 18 [top]).

The book is clearly printed, in fairly large type as far as the text is concerned, and is supplied with an 'index Graecitatis.' It is to be hoped that the editors will have the satisfaction of knowing their book is widely used.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

BROWN'S CASE CONSTRUCTIONS.

A Study of the Case Constructions of Words of Time. By LESTER DORMAN BROWN, Ph. D. Pp. iv + 141. Published by the Author, New Haven, Conn. 1904.

THE problem which the author of this monograph sets before himself is this: to discover the factors which determine the meaning of nouns whose primary meaning is that of

time, when used in the regular temporal construction of the genitive, dative, and accusative cases. The material upon which the study is based is taken from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*, and is intended to include all instances of nouns (or equivalent expressions) used in these writings in any of the regular temporal

constructions of the oblique cases. The number of nouns so used whose predominant meaning is not that of time is very small—only 11 out of a total of some 3100 cases—and the investigation therefore centres about the few common nouns of time, *ἡμέρα*, *νύξ*, *μῆν*, *ἔτος*, etc.

The question of the method of classification to be used, whether it shall be by form or by function, arises early, and as would be expected of one working in the atmosphere of the classical department of Yale University, the author chooses to classify by form: in this case the choice is unquestionably wise. The first two classifications are preliminary and serve to foreshadow the lines upon which the detailed examination of the cases is to proceed. The third primary classification consists of a complete index according to number, case, and modifiers, of all the nouns of time used in temporal constructions in the above authors: upon the basis of this classification the author takes up the question of the overlapping of various cases. He considers first the instances where he believes the genitive case to be used like a dative expressing 'the time when,' and cites numerous examples. The cases, however, where the genitive is used with a meaning indistinguishable from that of the dative, are not, I believe, as numerous as the author supposes. In the first place, exclusive of certain passages in Herodotus, whose usage in this matter is clearly divergent from the Attic usage, all the examples of such cases which are given are, with a single exception (Thuc. 6, 3, 2), either the noun *νύξ* or a season (*χειμῶν* or *θέρος*). For example in Xen. *Hell.* 1, 1, 13: αἱ νῆες ἄπασαι . . . τῆς ἐπιούσης νυκτὸς ἀνηγάγοντο, καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ ἡμέρᾳ περὶ ἀρίστου ὤραν ἦκον εἰς Προκόννησον. Mr. Brown holds that the meaning of the genitive is in no way different from that of the dative, the writer's purpose in both places being merely to date the action. But it will be admitted, I think, that an action can be dated in different ways. In some cases it is possible to use either the genitive or the dative, but is there not in most cases a slightly different shade of meaning according as one or the other case is used? Does not the frequent occurrence of the genitive *νυκτὸς* reflect the fact that from the nature of things the time of events of the night is less apt to be definitely known than the time of events of the day? I believe that the passages cited by the writer support this view. The dative *νυκτὶ* is cited in only four passages where it might seem not to differ in meaning from *νυκτὸς*; but in each of these cases a

special reason for the dative can, I think, be given. In *Hell.* 2, 1, 22: Λύσανδρος δὲ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ, ἐπεὶ ὄρθρος ἦν, ἐσήμηνεν εἰς τὰς ναὺς εἰσβαίνειν, Mr. Brown admits that the *ἐπεὶ* clause makes the dative natural; and in Thuc. 4, 103, 4: ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ κατέστησαν τὸν στρατὸν πρὸ ἔω κ.τ.λ., the time is rather definitely defined by πρὸ ἔω. Furthermore in Thuc. 7, 6, 4: καὶ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ ἐφθασαν παροικοδομήσαντες καὶ παρελθόντες τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων οἰκοδομίαν, the context shows that the exact time of the action was known to both the Athenians and the Syracusans; and in *Hell.* 4, 5, 4: φανερὸς δὲ ἐγένετο καὶ ὁ νεὺς τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ κυόμενος, the time was from the nature of the event likely to be definitely known. In my judgment, the only passage cited where the genitive seems not to differ appreciably in meaning from a dative is Thuc. 6, 3, 2 (τοῦ ἐχομένου ἔτους).

Three passages from Homer and one from Herodotus show the dative used like the genitive. But in *Anab.* 1, 8, 22 (*ἡμίσει χρόνῳ*) and Plut. *Aristid.* 23 (*ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ*), where the author takes the dative as equivalent in meaning to a genitive, he overlooks the possibility that the idea of means may be present; cf. *χρόνῳ* as used in *Her.* 1, 76 *et al.* and often in tragedy. The only examples that seem to show the genitive encroaching on the accusative are certain cases of *λοιποῖ*, 'in the future.' But in all except two of these cases the verb is negated, and, as the author says, here it is rather a case where the resultant meaning is the same whether the genitive or the accusative is used than an instance of the encroachment of one case on another. Clear examples of the use of the accusative for the dative are found only in Herodotus. On the whole then, the number of instances where any one case has the regular temporal meaning of another case is exceedingly small.

The results of the author's detailed examination of the genitive, dative, and accusative may be summed up briefly. In by far the greatest number of instances several factors make the temporal meaning clear without the aid of the inflectional ending. These factors are, in the order of their importance, first, the temporal meaning of the noun, and upon this the author rightly lays much stress; secondly, the modifying word, if any be present (*e.g.* a word of measure or a demonstrative word); thirdly, the verb, whether it expresses extensive or aoristic action; and lastly the context, in the broadest meaning of the term. As regards the expression of time by prepositional

phrases, examination shows that there is a marked preference for the equivalent case constructions of words of time.

On p. 68 the author gives an ingenious and plausible explanation of the origin of expressions which consist of a noun in the accusative singular with an ordinal numeral, translated usually by 'so many days (years, etc.) ago,' as *Hell.* 2, 4, 13: οἱ μὲν τὸ δεξιὸν ἔχοντες οὗς ὑμεῖς ἡμέραν πέμπτην τρεψάμενοι ἐδώξατε. He thinks they may have arisen from cases like *Anab.* 4, 5, 24: καταλαμβάνει πάντας ἔνδον τοὺς κωμήτας καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα τοῦ κωμάρχου ἐνάτην ἡμέραν γεγαμημένην, where the tense with which the temporal word is used may denote a state of continuance after the completion of the act. From such verbs the use of the noun with the ordinal was extended to verbs which express occurrence only.

The explanation which is given on pp. 96 f. of the origin of the genitive in statements of wages, as e.g. *Thuc.* 7, 27, 2: δραχμὴν γὰρ τῆς ἡμέρας ἕκαστος ἐλάμβανε, is ingenious, but to me not convincing. Comparing such expressions with expressions like *Anab.* 4, 6, 4: ἐπορεύθησαν ἐπὶ σταθμοὺς ἀνὰ πέντε παρασάγγας τῆς ἡμέρας, the author concludes that the genitive was originally closely connected with the verb. Now the genitive in such passages as the one from the *Anabasis*

clearly expresses the time within which the action of the verb takes place; he therefore suggests that the genitive in statements of wages may go back to a time when the pay was actually given and received some time during each day, comparing *Levit.* 19, 13 and *Deut.* 24, 15. It will be seen at once, I think, that this explanation rests upon a rather shadowy basis. I believe that an explanation of these genitives is rather to be sought along the line of such a sentence as *Anab.* 7, 6, 1: καὶ λέγει ὅτι δαρεῖκος ἐκάστῳ ἔσται μισθός τοῦ μηνός. If this case be taken by itself, it is entirely natural to take the genitive μηνός as depending immediately upon μισθός. Is it not then possible that these genitives, which in the historical period were doubtless almost purely formulaic, originally were dependent upon μισθός or an equivalent word, expressed or understood?

As is almost inevitable in a work of this kind, where the author is compelled to draw many minute distinctions, in some matters of detail the views expressed are open to question. But the work as a whole is done with painstaking care and accuracy. The main conclusions are amply sustained and the whole constitutes a suggestive and valuable beginning in a field of syntactical study which hitherto has been little explored.

HAVEN DARLING BRACKETT.

PROFUMO ON THE FIRE OF NERO.

ATTILIO PROFUMO, *Le fonti ed i tempi dell' incendio Neroniano*. Roma: Forzani, 1905. Pp. xii + 748. 20 lire.

THE first point that strikes one about the present work is its enormous size. It is a large and very heavy quarto (12½ × 8½ inches) with 49 lines to the page, and the amount of time and labour devoted to its production must have been immense. But one cannot help thinking that interesting and important as the fire of Nero is, especially to students of the early history of Christianity in Rome, Signor Profumo should have recollected that life is short and busy, and given us his results in a somewhat handier form.

The occasion of the work is a recently made assertion, formulated in a pamphlet by Prof. C. Pascal (*L'incendio di Roma e i primi Cristiani*, Milan 1900) that the Christians were as a fact the authors of the fire of Nero, taking 'qui fatebantur' in Tacitus,

Ann. xv. 44 § 5 to mean those who confessed their guilt as incendiaries; their denunciations of their fellow Christians led to the latter being proved guilty also, not however as incendiaries, but as Christians ('deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis convicti sunt'). This charge naturally aroused much opposition: and the present work, the most careful study of the subject that has yet been made, brings us to the opposite conclusion. It has met with a favourable reception in the archaeological journals of Rome—such as the *Bullettino d'Archeologia Cristiana*, and the *Bullettino Comunale*.

The first part (pp. 1–194) deals exhaustively with the ancient authorities, whose testimony, with the single exception of that of Tacitus, who remarks 'sequitur clades, forte an dolo principis incertum (nam utrumque auctores prodidere),' asserts unanimously that

Nero was the author of the fire. Here, and indeed throughout the book, there is a great deal too much detail not directly bearing on the point at issue, e.g. before citing the testimony of Suetonius and Tacitus on the subject, it is hardly necessary to devote over twenty pages (23-44) to a discussion of their merits as historians and the relative value which is to be attached to their statements. Nor does it seem to me that the indirect evidence adduced by Signor Profumo is sufficient to justify his conclusion that Cluvius Rufus and Fabius Rusticus agreed with Pliny the elder (the third of his 'fonti prime' or contemporary sources) in asserting (*H.N.* xvii. 1 § 5) that Nero was the author of the fire, and that it was the 'official version' which attributed the occurrence to chance.

The second part (pp. 195-353) deals with the persecution of the Christians. We find Pliny the younger in his correspondence with Trajan, telling the emperor 'cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam: ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri' (*Ep.* x. 96) and Trajan replies 'conqu岸endi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt' (*ib.* x. 97). As Signor Profumo shows, it seems clear from this and from Tertullian's *Apologeticum* that there was no special law against the Christians *qua* Christians: they were affected by the *leges sumptuariæ*, as guilty of evil customs, by the *lex Iulia de peculatu et de sacrilegiis*, as offenders against religion, by the *lex Iulia de maiestate imminuta*, as guilty of 'maiestas.'

These three charges were grouped, as Tertullian says, in the one *institutum Neronianum* (*ad nationes*, i. 7), which continued to exist till the Edict of Milan (313 A.D.), so that to be proved a Christian was enough to be condemned (*Apol.* 2). But they first appear together under Tiberius in the trial of Libo Drusus (*Tac. Ann.* ii. 27) and again in that of Appuleia Varilla (*ibid.* ii. 50), and Nero used them against pagans as well as Christians (e.g. Thrasea Paetus). The most important question (the doubt about which has even led some to suppose the whole account of Tacitus to be a forgery) is, why Nero pitched upon the Christians. They seem so far to have attracted little attention and it seems clear from Tertullian that this was the first persecution they had to undergo. Signor Profumo thinks that they were not actually charged with incendiarism (or we should have had some trace of the charge in the official version) but simply used to distract popular attention from the question as to the culpability of the emperor, by being

brought to trial and condemned on the charge of being Christians, in which capacity they were already hated. This, however, would not have been so likely to produce the effect desired by Nero, and I doubt very much whether the well known words of Tacitus, 'ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos et quæsitissimis poenis adfecit quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat,' will bear this sense. 'Subdidit reos' naturally means 'fraudulently brought to trial' (on the charge just mentioned by Tacitus, i.e. that of incendiarism). That, on the other hand they were condemned *en masse* as Christians and not as incendiaries there seems little doubt: but, as Furneaux says, in his note on *Tac. Ann.* xv. 44 § 5 ('qui fatebantur') 'the difficulty would disappear on the supposition that the Christians as a body had already been marked out by some means as the incendiaries, so that the question whether a person was a Christian became the most essential part of the charge against him.'

Signor Profumo, on the other hand, is inclined to believe that the Christians were already numerous and hated, and also actually feared as enemies of the empire, and that the reasons for the persecution were mainly political. The date of the event he places not immediately after the fire, but some months later, after Nero's attempts to assert his innocence had failed, i.e. in the spring or early summer of 65 A.D. It would then be still easier to connect with it the martyrdom of S. Peter, if not of S. Paul (who as a Roman citizen, would have been differently treated) as Dufourq (*Étude sur les gesta martyrum, Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises*, fasc. 83, pp. 104 sqq.), even accepting the usual date (August ?—at any rate after July 28th, 64 A.D.) of the persecution, proposes to do.

As to this, though Eusebius, Jerome, and Orosius may be taken to indicate the later date, Tacitus does not distinguish it as occurring in a different year from that of the fire; and the beginning of *Ann.* xv. 47 'fine anni vulgantur prodigia,' long after the account of the fire is over, seems to be contrary to this supposition.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that the traditional date of the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul and 979 others 'Via Aurelia' is the 29th of June.

¹ The theory that S. Peter was crucified on the site of the church of S. Pietro in Montorio has little to recommend it. The latest article against it is that of Marucchi in *Nuovo Bullettino Cristiano*, 1905, 135 sqq., 269 sqq.

The third part (pp. 354-482) deals with the fire itself, and Nero's motives for causing it. Tacitus tells us that it was thought that Nero wanted to have the credit for founding a new Rome, in which his own palace—the Domus Aurea—was to form the most prominent feature. The idea of expropriation for purposes of public utility was unknown to Roman jurisprudence, as Signor Profumo shows: and the only possible means for Nero to effect his purpose would have been a series of wholesale confiscations, which would have affected all classes, and was obviously impossible. After a fire, on the other hand, the emperor habitually intervened (though not as dictator, as our author supposes (pp. 411 *sqq.*), for there is no trace of the dictatorship in the Principate as founded by Augustus)¹ and took the measures necessary in each case.

No doubt the city was in need of rebuilding, as Suetonius hints: and Signor Profumo well points out, that, narrow as the streets of ancient Rome seem to us (the standard width of the highroads in the immediate neighbourhood of the city, where there was far more vehicular traffic than in Rome itself, is only fourteen feet, and the Sacra Via itself is very little more), some Romans actually objected to their excessive width after the fire of Nero (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 43).

But of course Nero took advantage of the conflagration to appropriate to his own Domus Aurea a considerable portion of the city which had belonged to private owners—hence the haste of Vespasian to destroy it. (Martial, *De Spect.* 2: cf. the epigram quoted by Suetonius, *Nero*, 39)

'Roma domus fiet: Veios migrate, Quirites,
'Si non et Veios occupat ista domus'.)

Signor Profumo's topography, by the way, is at fault when he remarks (p. 440) 'e sola giungere a noi di tanta Domus—dimenticata, nascosta sotterra ai servigi delle nemiche terme di Tito, e di poi, e di queste e delle Traianee,—la grande piscina vinaria sita all' Esquilino, oggidì nomata le Sette Sale.' In the first place, the Sette Sale is not a subterranean reservoir: and in the second place, he has entirely forgotten the famous 'Camere Esquiline' with their splendid (though now much faded) frescoes, and many other remains enumerated by Lanciani (*Ruins and Excavations*, 361):

¹ Tac. i. 9 § 6 is perfectly clear—'non regno tamen, neque dictatura sed principis nomine constitutam rempublicam.'

cf. also *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1897, 59; *Bullettino Comunale* 1897, 165.

He makes, on the other hand, an interesting observation—that Nero, in starting the fire at the point he did, was probably calculating upon the W.S.W. breeze which rarely fails in a summer afternoon: but that the wind must have changed to scirocco (S.E.), inasmuch as the fire, instead of taking the expected direction, went N.W. along the length of the circus (p. 477).

The fourth part (pp. 483-693) is devoted (1) to critical notes on the sources of Tacitus' information for the fifteenth book of the *Annals*. Signor Profumo supposes that his information was drawn from the Emperor Nerva, though I must confess that I fail to see the strength of his arguments; (2) to an examination of the reasons for the silence of Juvenal as to the fire, which he puts down to the fact of the publication of the first group of the Satires under Nerva, who had probably been a member of Nero's *concilium* (Furneaux on Tac. *Ann.* xv. 72) and apparently intimate with him (Martial *Epig.* viii. 70, ix. 26). The assumption is again made (pp. 570-574) without sufficient reason, and rather upon general considerations, setting aside the specific evidence to the contrary;² (3) to a discussion of the legend that Nero sang while Rome was burning, which he accepts as credible; (4) to an examination of coins of Nero (Cohen, 126-130) hitherto supposed to represent the MAC(ellum), but which Signor Profumo refers either to the MAC(hina), i.e. the *coenatio rotunda* of the Domus Aurea, or, preferably, to MAC(ellum) in the sense of 'parco campestre a vivaria,' supposing it to be a name given by Nero to that part of the Domus Aurea which contained the wild animals of which Suetonius (*Nero*, 31) speaks, in which the building represented, with its two orders of porticoes and a central dome, was situated.

The book is furnished with several indices—including an index of method, which, with all the long discussions on method in the text, is an entirely superfluous guarantee of the author's *bona fides*—and bears marks of care in the correction of the proofs. As I have said, the task accomplished by the author is a most laborious one—and unnecessarily so. The vessel might have been lightened by throwing overboard a large

² He seems to infer from Weidner's silence as to the identification of Marius with Marius Priscus condemned in 99/100 in viii. 120 that he was 'already beginning to give up' the theory: but Weidner had already specifically accepted it in i. 49, where Marius is mentioned.

quantity of useless ballast—as it is, it is not unlikely to sink by its own weight, which is a pity, as despite the hardly justifiable inferences which I have mentioned, the book contains good matter, and would, were it mercilessly pruned and freed of repetitions and passages irrelevant to the point at issue, be a work deserving of attention. If

I have in any point misjudged it, I can only plead that the time that I have been able to devote to it has not been sufficient to allow of my reading every word of it—a thing which, I fear, few will have the patience to do.

THOMAS ASHBY, JUNIOR.

HARDY'S STUDIES IN ROMAN HISTORY.

Studies in Roman History. By E. G. HARDY, M.A., D.Litt., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford. London & New York: The Macmillan Company. 1906. Pp. viii + 349. 6s., \$1.60.

MR. HARDY reprints in this volume his well known and favourably received work of 1894 on Christianity and the Roman Government (Chapters I.-X.), and six additional studies (Chapter XI.-XVI.) which have appeared from time to time in the *English Historical Review* and the *Journal of Philology* in practically their present form: Legions in the Pannonian Rising; Movements of the Legions from Augustus to Severus; The Provincial Concilia; Imperium Consulare or Proconsulare; Plutarch, Tacitus, Suetonius, on Galba and Otho; A Bodleian MS. of Pliny's Letters to Trajan.

It will be a matter of regret to the many who have profited by Mr. Hardy's useful studies on Christianity and the Roman Government to find that the work appears again merely as a reprint, without revision, or even the addition of a much needed index, to say nothing of the amplification which they would have liked to possess from the hand of a scholar so experienced and discriminating. The impulse to censure the author, however, for republishing in its original form a work already twelve years old, and on a subject which is constantly being investigated, will quickly die out at the reading of the prefatory notice, in which Mr. Hardy explains his action; and disappointment will be tempered by the reflection that the thorough revision which he would have given the work had circumstances permitted would have had the effect of modifying it in detail only. To mention

a single field in which there has been a great deal of activity since the appearance of Mr. Hardy's book, the utilization of the numerous studies on the Neronian fire and persecution which appeared in 1901 and 1902 over the names of Pascal, Coen, Ferrara, and other Italian scholars, would have resulted in no modification of his views worth mentioning. The main conclusions which made Mr. Hardy's book valuable in 1894 will make it welcome and profitable for the student of to-day. A work based upon such solid foundations as the scholarship of Mommsen and Ramsay, and elaborated by so sure a hand as that of Mr. Hardy, does not lose its usefulness in so short a time.

The remaining six studies of the book are characterized by the same thoroughness, accuracy, and independence of judgment. Chapters XI., XII., and XIII. are of especial interest, and of these the two last, on Movements of Legions from Augustus to Severus, and Provincial Concilia, are valuable original contributions for which every student of Roman administration will be grateful. One could wish indeed that the author's love of conciseness and his intentness upon the matter in hand did not result in a rigidity and angularity of presentation not altogether agreeable; inordinately long paragraphs and an unconciliatory style do not lighten the difficulty of following matter already difficult itself. But the feeling most prominent on leaving Mr. Hardy's book is one of regret that he is not to put us further under obligation by continuing his admirable contributions.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

The University of Wisconsin.

SCHULZE ON LATIN PROPER NAMES.

Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen.

By WILHELM SCHULZE. Pp. 1-582 Text, 583-646 Addenda, Indices, and Contents (being No. 5 of Vol. V. of the *Abhandlungen* of the Göttingen Kön. Gesellsch. d. Wissenschaften). Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin, 1904. M. 40.

THIS most valuable book marks a noteworthy epoch in the study of the languages of Ancient Italy. The indescribable confusion and delay produced in every department of that study by Corssen's attempt to interpret Etruscan as an Indo-European tongue and to explain a mass of Latin and Oscan words by reference to Etruscan could only be ended by a rigorous boycott of the intrusive alien. And from 1886, the greatest date since Bopp in the history of Comparative Philology, when the first volume of Brugmann's *Grundriss* finally established it as one of the Historical Sciences, till 1897, the common effort of all workers in the Italic field was to free the tradition of their subject from the mass of falsities and obscurantisms with which the school of Corssen had cumbered it. In these years Von Planta's *Oskisch-Umbrische Grammatik*, Buck's *Oskischer Vokalismus*, Stolz and Schmalz's *Lateinische Grammatik*, Lindsay's *Latin Language* and my own edition of the remains of *The Italic Dialects* were being written. All these books showed clearly the resolve to purge their subject-matter of its Etruscan contamination, so as to judge purely Italic questions on purely Italic evidence. The attempt was in none of us, perhaps, completely successful, but in all alike it was absolutely necessary, for until this was done, it was impossible to say, of a multitude of forms and changes, which were characteristically Etruscan, and which Oscan, Umbrian, Faliscan, Sabine (or even Latin) as the case might be. A glance at any of Zvetiaeff's collections (not to mention Fabretti's *Corpus Insc. Italicarum*) will show how many scores of non-Italic inscriptions their successors had to sift out. The eels had to be 'ponded' before they could be caught. But now that this has been done, and the scientific methods of the new generation of Etruscologists, like Pauli, Skutsch, and Torp, have begun to lay the foundations for a real study of Etruscan as a non-kindred though contiguous speech, it has become possible to enquire reasonably

what influence Etruscan and the Italic group of languages had upon one another during the many centuries in which they were spoken side by side. The main purpose which Prof. Schulze has set before him in his monumental study of Latin Proper Names is to analyse carefully the Etruscan elements discernible in Latin nomenclature: this theme, carried out with sober insight and devoted industry, occupies 360 out of the 596 quarto pages of the text, and in fact colours all the rest.

The results, though not perhaps of a startling kind, are extensive and really valuable both to the philologist and the historian, though the author modestly abstains from doing more than indicate the kind of historical inferences that can be drawn from them: e.g. on p. 218, where he shows that the names of the three primitive Roman tribes (*Ramnes*, *Tities*, *Luceres*) are the names of three Etruscan gentes. Similarly by a long train of morphological evidence he may, I think, claim to have established that *Roma*, Etr. **ruma*, was (like *Caecina*, *Sulla*, *Serva*, *Casca*, *Sora*,) the name of an Etruscan gens to which the *rumate* or *rumaθe* of Clusium, the city of Por-senna (gens *Romatia* in N. Italy), the *rumulna* of Volci (= gens *Romilia* of the ager Vaticanus with their real or mythical ancestor *Romulus*) and possibly also the *C. Sex. Romaei Tusci* of a (fairly late) seal from Telesia in Samnium are akin. A careful reader of Schulze's own abundant and frankly sifted evidence—especially of such an admission as that on pp. 136-7 that the Etr. name *cesu* may be, not like *Cesina* a direct derivative from the simpler name *ceisi*, but merely a 'Rückbildung' or re-construction out of *Caesonius*, the Latin form of the name—will not, I think, feel that it is so absolutely certain as Schulze assumes (p. 580) that the gens *ruma* really gave their name to the city and not vice versa. But it does not appear to me to admit of any doubt (1) that the gens *Romilia* (older form, *Romulia*) were of Tuscan origin; (2) that their ancestor *Romulus* (all *-io-* nomina being of course patronymics from simpler forms, *Sextius* from *Sextus*, etc.) derived his name from an Etr. gentile name *roma* (in Etr. spelling *ruma*) by one of the Etruscan methods of derivation (p. 394); and (3) that a great many of the old names of Rome are simply those of Etruscan families—*Capena*

and *Ratumenna* are Etruscan nomina with the Etr. -na suffix, just as Tarquinii, Volsinii, Volcii, Veii, and many more (pp. 564 f.) are names of Etruscan gentes in a Latin and plural form. All this being clear, the question whether the name *Roma* or the *gens roma* was prior, though interesting, loses somewhat in importance, and may well be left to be determined by evidence of another kind, some of which I have elsewhere¹ discussed, and to which I must return ere long. If by Romulus we mean the man who first built a wall round the city, then Schulze's view may well be accepted; but if we are asking whether it was a Sabine or Ligurian (Volco-Latin) who first set *tuguri congestum caespitis culmen* on Tiber's bank, that is another and probably a much older story.

This new light on early Roman history is perhaps the most striking fruit of the whole research, but it is probably only an earnest of larger results which will follow when the mass of knowledge of ancient nomenclature, here for the first time collected in more or less systematic form, has been digested and applied to the many different ends for which it is of use. No one can hope to discuss, to any profit, for any purpose whatever, the form or history of any name found anywhere in the whole Romanised world, without quarrying in the valuable² Indices which conclude this treatise. Keltic, Venetic, Illyrian, Spanish, Etruscan, African, and many other local influences, racial, religious, social, and legal conditions; phonetic, grammatical, and historical causes of change; in short, the thousand and one factors that determine the form and use of human names, so far as they could be traced by an encyclopaedic study of the records of all the communities that ever spoke Latin, are all, in some measure at least, represented in Prof. Schulze's teeming pages. And even the student whose immediate concern is merely with language cannot afford to neglect the fresh light that is incidentally thrown on a great many points of many languages of the Italian area (including all Romance), and especially upon Etruscan. How many educated Englishmen know, I wonder, that our common suffix -ess (*princess, tailoress*) is Macedonian (*βασίλισσα*), or

that the even commoner -ette (*planchette, suffragette*) is Etruscan (*lautnita* or *lautniba* 'libertella,' the daughter of a *lautni* 'libertus')? These are not Schulze's own discoveries (the second is Deecke's), but they naturally appear in this comprehensive collection of evidence (p. 77). And even the humblest reader of Vergil will be glad to know that such ethnic adjectives as *Saticulus* from the place-name *Saticulum*, are not a poet's tour de force, but a genuinely old Latin and Italic idiom (p. 553).

In noticing a book of such a wide range it is hardly worth while to dwell on single points in which it seems to need supplement or correcting; but I should perhaps mention that in the *Atti* of the Congress at Rome in 1903 already referred to, which I think Schulze nowhere cites, the author would have found at least two or three papers which bore directly on more than one of his points; especially that on the historical significance of the -CO- and -NO- ethnica, and another on the *gens Romilia*. And I would venture to demur to the use of the term 'latinisch' (not *lateinisch*) in a new sense. It was coined, I believe, to denote urban Latin and the group of dialects most closely akin to it, viz. Faliscan, Sabine, Marsian, and Praenestine—all, in fact, which do not turn *q* into *p*. Why need it be used in the wider sense of 'Italic,' a term which is surely beyond reproach? No one objects to the name 'German' because a number of Lithuanian dialects are also spoken within the limits of Germany.³ If a term be needed (which I doubt) for the purely geographical sense in which Schulze wishes 'Italic' to be used, 'Italensian' might serve.

But there are one or two criticisms on wider matters of method which I must venture at least to indicate.

The great difficulty in basing any sound grammatical conclusions on lists of names, as Schulze himself often realises (in criticising⁴

³ Other very doubtful points to me are the extraordinary (p. 106) denial of the identity of *Volens* and *Volusus* (cf. *modestus* : *venustus*, etc.); the dogmatic separation (p. 90) of Umb. *Hoier* and *Hude* (why not as *Iouii* : *Iouii*?); and the apparent assertion (p. 372) that such nicknames as 'leg' (*Sura*), 'forest' (*Silea*), 'window' (*Fenestella*) could not have been given (save by unintentional coincidence) in such a country as Italy.

⁴ The least happy feature of the book is the tone in which Prof. Schulze regularly speaks of his predecessors, on whose labours his own work is based. Of all these Bicheler alone is mentioned without direct censure. And why should a huge treatise on a small department of Latin and Etruscan Grammar pour contempt on 'Grammarians' and

¹ *Le due strati di popolazione Indo-Europea dell'Italia primitiva* in vol. II. of the *Atti* of the Historical Congress at Rome, 1903.

² But far from complete. Why, for instance, do they omit all reference to the Oscan forms *Dekkiiis*, etc., discussed at two pages' length (see below)? And is it the Index or the book which omits all consideration of the form *Etruscus* (as contrasted with *Tuscus*)?

Pauli), is the absence of definite chronological criteria. Roughly speaking, Etruscan insc. are older than Roman,—but only roughly. They range over at least five centuries, and when to the Etruscan names themselves are added the Italic originals from which a mass of them were drawn, and the modern derivatives to which they have given birth, the limits of time are enormously extended. Now with all the caution of his temperament, the author still does not appear to have given quite enough weight to this element of doubt. I have indicated one such case already in discussing the name *Roma*. Another will be found in the unhappy confusion in which the reader is left (p. 106) as to the Latinised Umbrian forms (a) *Volstienus* and (b) *Volsienus*, and the Etr. (c) *velzna*, (d) *vušina*. It is demonstrable, as Von Planta pointed out, and as Schulze rather grudgingly admits, that (b) is the later form of (a), and but for what seems a rather perverse desire to reprove Von Planta for not dealing with the Etruscan forms—an abstinence of vital importance to Von Planta's own subject—Schulze must surely have realised that (c) is the early Etruscan original of (a), and that (d) is a later Etruscan adaptation or reconstruction of (b). The same neglect of chronology and the same prejudice against a view of Von Planta's (as to the Oscan origin of the doubled consonant in *Deccius*, *Stemnius*, etc.), for which the evidence is simply overwhelming, has led Schulze to reject this view and put nothing in its place but a cloud of confusion (p. 282).

The inherent difficulties of a very abstract subject have not, it must be confessed, been diminished by the method in which it is presented. The four or five large divisions of the book are clearly right, and probably in their best order; but as soon as the reader plunges into any of these huge chapters, he is completely lost. This is because the author

gives no numbers to his paragraphs nor headlines to his pages and has the unhappy habit of not stating the proposition he wishes to prove until after he has gone over the evidence. The reader must carry in his head page after page of names, and apparently pointless observations about them, until at last the author condescends to explain why he has cited them. This is partly a grim kind of playfulness, partly an extraordinary misapplication of the 'Heuristic method.' The book begins with a typical example. After 12½ pages of what the author justly describes as 'somewhat tedious (*etwas umständliche*) remarks on well-known points' of late Gallic Latin (from Ausonius, Gregory of Tours, and the like), the reader is told that they were 'mainly' (*zunächst*) intended to clear up the author's own mind, but that they may perhaps provide a good background for the rest of the book! Why could not this naive paragraph have come on p. 1 instead of p. 13? Does the author regard his readers (surely an inoffensive class of persons!) as natural enemies whom it is a delight to afflict without cause? In point of style and arrangement to turn from any six pages of Brugmann, Meyer-Lübke, Fick, Kretschmer, or Skutsch to any six pages of this book, is to step from the XXth century into the XIVth. So magnificent a collection of facts,¹ to which the labour of years must have been devoted, deserved to be presented in a lucid form. No doubt it will be ere long, by some younger scholar, who will hardly need to go outside the covers of Prof. Schulze's great dissertation to find the material for a book of remarkable interest.

R. S. CONWAY.

MANCHESTER, September 1906.

¹ 'Etruscologists' (pp. 90 and 106)? Is our toilet some profession in any danger of standing too high in the eyes of the world at large?

¹ It is impossible to mention all the interesting topics raised: the original namelessness of women in Italy p. 50; family-gods (123); the Etruscan origin (e.g. 274) of apparently Latin aspirates (*Gracchus*, *Matho*); the 'Lager-Rinder' (60); the Kelts in Spain (27); the self-assertion that appears in the name *via Appia* (instead of *via Claudia* which custom enjoined, p. 512) are some that have struck me most.

VERSION.

SOLILOQUY OF THE SPANISH
CLOISTER.

GR-R-R—there go my heart's abhorrence!
 Water your damned flower-pots, do!
 If hate killed men, Brother Lawrence,
 God's blood, wouldn't mine kill you?
 What? your myrtle-bush wants trimming?
 Oh, that rose has prior claims—
 Needs its leaden vase filled brimming?
 Hell dry you up with its flames!

At the meal we sit together:
Salve tibi! I must hear
 Wise talk of the kind of weather,
 Sort of season, time of year:
Not a plenteous cork-crop: scarcely
Dare we hope oak-galls, I doubt:
What's the Latin name for 'parsley'?
 What's the Greek name for Swine's Snout?

Whew! We'll have our platter burnished,
 Laid with care on our own shelf!
 With a fire-new spoon we're furnished,
 And a goblet for ourself,
 Rinsed like something sacrificial
 Ere 'tis fit to touch our chaps—
 Marked with L for our initial!
 (He-he! There his lily snaps!)

Saint, forsooth! While brown Dolores
 Squats outside the Convent bank
 With Sanchicha, telling stories,
 Steeping tresses in the tank,
 Blue-black, lustrous, thick like horsehairs,
 Can't I see his dead eye glow
 Bright as 'twere a Barbary corsair's?
 (That is, if he'd let it show!)

When he finishes refection,
 Knife and fork he never lays
 Crosswise, to my recollection,
 As I do in Jesu's praise.

IDEM LATINE.

[*In piam memoriam sonitus uerborum iam
 paene obsoleti.*]

Pfui, pecus inuisum, sic pergite pergite, et
 horti
 Spargite uasa ista, quod male uertat, aqua.
 Letiferas odium plagas si infligere possit,
 Vah, noster, iaceas tu cito, Marce, meo.
 I nunc, luxuriam myrti sic falce putato;
 Attat, cura prior, sic rosa poscit opem:
 Funde cauom in plumbum, lymphas infunde
 replentis.
 Te Phlegethon utinam torreat igne suo.
 Cenanti ille mihi cubat ad latus; instat
 ineptae,
 'Salue' cum dictumst, garrulitatis homo;
 Vt contristet hiemps, aestas ut torreat,
 annum,
 Qua pluuiâ uento sole sit hora, crepat.
 'Suber,' ait, 'uereor tenui ne cortice fallat;
 Horna quidem gallas uix, puto, quercus
 habet:
 Dic, sodes, apium Graece quid dicitur?'—
 Ohe,
 Dic, quid hyosrhynchus dicitur Hebraice?
 Audin' quae garrit? Poliendast nempe patella
 Propria et in proprio constituenda loco.
 'Est mihi,' ait, 'cochleare, recens quod
 splendet ab igni,
 Estque calix, at tu tangere parce meam.'
 Purgat aqua calicem — sacratam credere
 dicas—
 Tum demum dignam scilicet ore suo:
 Nominis inscriptast argento littera prima.
 (Euax! sic rupto lilia caule dole.)
 Tune exemplum hominis? Fuscus est ubi
 Thestylis oris
 Sub ripa nostras assidet ante fores:
 Fabellas illic cum Nysa auditque refertque,
 In gelido gaudens tingere fonte comam:
 Caerula quanta comast, saetis nitet aemula
 equinis;
 Quane acie spectes dissimulare cupis?
 Ille hebes ante oculis praedo tunc acre tuere
 Ceu Libys, hoc prae te si modo ferre
 uelis.
 Cena ubi confectast, recte si uisa recorder,
 Cultello haud cochlear iungere more pio,
 Haud crucis in speciem meminit componere
 sanctam,
 Id quod ego, ut, Iesu, sit tibi dignus
 honos.

I the Trinity illustrate
 Drinking watered orange-pulp—
 In three sips the Arian frustrate,
 While he drains his at one gulp.
 Oh, those melons? If he's able
 We're to have a feast; so nice!
 One goes to the Abbot's table,
 All of us get each a slice.
 How go on your flowers? None double?
 Not one fruit-sort can you spy?
 Strange!—and I too at such trouble
 Keep them close-nipped on the sly.
 There's a great text in Galatians,
 Once you trip on it, entails
 Twenty-nine distinct damnations,
 One sure, if another fails:
 If I trip him just a-dying,
 Sure of heaven as sure can be,
 Spin him round and send him flying
 Off to Hell, a Manichee?
 Or, my scrofulous French novel
 On grey paper with blunt type!
 Simply glance at it, you grovel
 Hand and foot in Belial's gripe:
 If I double down its pages
 At the woeful sixteenth print,
 When he gathers his greengages,
 Ope a sieve and slip it in 't?
 Or there's Satan! One might venture
 Pledge one's soul to him, yet leave
 Such a flaw in the indenture
 He would miss till, past retrieve,
 Blasted lay that rose-acacia
 We're so proud of! *Hy, Zy, Hine* . . .
 'St, there's Vespers! Plena gratiâ
 Ave, Virgo! Gr-r-r—you swine!

BROWNING.

Tundimus in lympha poma aurea; tunc ego
 potans
 Testor tergemini numina sancta dei:
 Ter libans quisquis triplicem negat esse
 refuto,
 Exhaust calicem protinus ille suam.
 En peponum cultor! Promittit numine
 dextro—
 O sapor, o bona lux—gaudia tanta dapis.
 'Pontificis, fratres, unus compleuerit orbem
 Sectorum, nulli pars sua deerit,' ait.
 Quid? Stirpesne uigent istae? Num flos-
 culus ulli
 Amplior? in pomum gemma nec una tumet?
 Id tu miraris? Mea sedula cura meusque
 Germina furtiuo subsecat ungue labor.
 Insignem praebet monitum liber ille Sibyllae;
 Parendumst toti ne mala summa feras;
 Namque e ter denis si uerbo erraueris uno,
 Taetra per aeternamst poena luenda
 diem:
 Illi si laqueum morienti tendere possim,
 Spe sibi cum certa praecipit Elysium,
 Vt iuuat inuerso deiectum impellere cursu;
 'I, pete Tartareas, dis odium acre, domos.'
 Siue Priapeis hominem stet perdere—foedi
 Scriptura obtunsast, charta subalba, libri—
 Quam leuis ille labor: modo chartam euolue,
 necessest
 Aeternum iratos experiare deos.
 Impuram in promptust oculis offerre tabellam;
 Pictam habet undecimae quae scheda
 quinta subit:
 Marcus ubi sua pruna leget, cum fiscina
 iuxtast,
 Quin ausim hic passum supposuisse librum?
 An niger ille deus lege hac orabitur adsit
 Mortuos ut teneat sub dicione sua?
 Tum faciam in pacto uerbi sic fallere mendum
 Vt mihi rem, quamuis non nociturus, agat.
 Sic decus illorum rubicundis floribus arbor
 Marcescat uiridem non renouanda comam.
 Huc, Satana, huc ades, huc—St! Quid sonat?
 Hora precandist:
 Sancta dea—i, grunni, sus comitate sues.

JOHN SARGEANT.

'Swine's snout finxit poeta: hyosrhynchus, cf. hyoseyamus. St. συλλεβικὸς Ter. Ph. 743.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

WHO WAS THE WIFE OF ZEUS?

(Continued from page 378.)

It appears, then, that Zeus and Herakles exchanged partners, Zeus taking Hera, and Herakles taking Dia (Hebe). Several consequences of this mutual accommodation would be worth investigating, did space permit. For example, it would follow that Herakles was originally a sort of Zeus. In Italy sundry inscriptions, one of a very ancient date,¹ attest the cult of Hercules Iovius,² while conversely in the island of Issa Q. Baronius erects a temple and altars Iovi Hercli.³ In Greece too there is said to have been a Zeus Ἡρακλῆς,⁴ and certainly Zeus took over the part of Herakles; for, whereas Herakles was called Ἡραϊος,⁵ presumably as being the associate of Hera, there was an Attic cult of Zeus Ἡραϊος.⁶ Athena whom the tragedians address as Διὸς κόρη,⁷ is on a black-figured amphora from Caere inscribed Ἡρακλέους κόρη,⁸ which may account for the constant association of Herakles and Athena in vase-paintings.⁹ True, there was a tradition that Hera suckled Herakles¹⁰; but then none could be an immortal god unless he had sucked the breast of Hera¹¹—one more hint at matrilineal descent. Hence too the fictitious birth of Herakles from Hera,¹² and the

remarkable inscription on an Etruscan mirror¹³ (fig. 4) which, like the Theban hymn quoted by Ptolemy Chennos,¹⁴ describes Herakles as the son of Hera.¹⁵ This mirror deserves attention¹⁶; for not only does it represent Herakles in closest intimacy with Hera, but Zeus who stands behind Hera is signing to Hebe or Dia who stands behind Herakles.¹⁷ The artist obviously intended to suggest some connexion between Zeus and Hebe, since he has given them both an adornment of two leaves stuck in their hair—a device unique in Etruscan art. Had he an inkling of the primitive pairing Hera~Herakles and Zeus~Dia? Again, if Herakles was a second Zeus, we can understand his association with the oak,¹⁸ the wild-olive,¹⁹ and the poplar,²⁰ for these are precisely the trees with which Zeus was associated.²¹ Further, if Herakles was analogous to Zeus, his amazing popularity in both literature and art receives for the first time an adequate explanation. References to and representations of him are far more frequent than is

¹³ Gerhard *Etruskische Spiegel* v. 73 ff. pl. 60. The inser. runs *eca : xren : | tra : iχna | c : hercle : | unial : clān : θra : ace*, and the only intelligible words *hercle : unial : clān* denote 'Hercules son of Uni (Juno).'

¹⁴ *Supra* p. 368.

¹⁵ Dr. Postgate suggests that this scene represents the consummation of the apotheosis of Herakles and that Hera's act is the seal of his immortality. By it she says in fact *illum ego—adscribi quietis ordinibus patiar deorum*. Hor. *carmin.* iii. 3. 33 sq.

¹⁶ The illustration in the text is reduced from Gerhard *op. cit.* v. pl. 60.

¹⁷ So G. Körte in Gerhard *op. cit.* v. 73, though he does not name Hebe. The design is completed by the presence of Apollo on the left, Artemis (?) in the background, a Silenos drinking above, and an Eros with an egg (?) below.

¹⁸ Soph. *Trach.* 766, 1168, 1195, Callim. *hymn. Dian.* 159, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 351. 1. Plin. *hist. nat.* 16. 239, Dessau 3080. On coins Herakles' club in an oak-wreath is frequent: e.g. *Brit. Mus. Cat. Gk. Coins Macedonia*, etc. pp. 7 f., 14, 16 f., 42, 46 f., *ib.* Thessaly to Aetolia pp. 92, 181, 183 f., *ib.* Caria, etc. pp. 10 f., *ib.* Lycania, etc. pp. 183 f., *ib.* Lydia pp. 238 f. Cp. S. Reinach *Pierres gravées* pl. 100, 31.

¹⁹ Pind. *Ol.* 3. 13 ff., Paus. 5. 7. 7, schol. vet. Ar. *Plut.* 586, Aristot. *mir. ausc.* 51, Soph. *Trach.* 1196 f., Plin. *hist. nat.* 16. 89. *Brit. Mus. Cat. Bronzes* p. 219 no. 1294, *Brit. Mus. Cat. Gk. Vases* iv. 106 no. F 211.

²⁰ Paus. 5. 14. 2, Theocr. 2. 121 with schol. ad loc., Ov. *her.* 9. 64, Verg. *eccl.* 7. 61, Serv. in Verg. *eccl.* 7. 61, Aen. 5. 134. *Brit. Mus. Cat. Sculpture* iii. 93 no. 1731, *Brit. Mus. Cat. Bronzes* p. 219 no. 1297, Furtwängler *Ant. Gemm.* pl. 41, 35 and 37.

²¹ Folk-lore xv. 295 ff., *ib.* xvi. 279 ff.

¹ *C. I. L.* ix. 324 no. 3414 = Dessau 3431.

² Roscher *Lex.* i. 2255, 8 ff., 2946, 61 ff., 3007, 51 ff.

³ *C. I. L.* iii. 1. 393 no. 3075.

⁴ Daremberg-Saglio *Dict. Ant.* iii. 141: the only evidence known to me is Ael. *hist. an.* 17. 46, on which see *supra* p. 367 n. 7. Cp. Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 1506 n. 1, and the name Heraclammon in Vopisc. *Aur.* 22 ff.

⁵ Hesych. Ἡραϊος · Ἡρακλέα.

⁶ *C. I. A.* i. 5 no. 4, 21. Towards the end of Gamelon a kid is to be sacrificed to Dionysos, a table set for Herakles, an offering made to the hero Paragne[sios?], a pig slain for Zeus Ἡραϊος, a lamb for Hermes, etc.

⁷ Aesch. *Eum.* 415, Eur. *Ion* 21, *Phoen.* 1373, cp. *Trö.* 526.

⁸ Helbig in the *Bull. dell' Inst.* 1866 p. 181, P. Gardner *Cat. Gk. Vases in Ashmolean Mus.* no. 212, pl. 2, Kretschmer *Die gr. Vasenschriftl.* p. 198 no. 179.

⁹ Walters' *Hist. of Ancient Pottery* ii. 38, 95, 105.

¹⁰ Paus. 9. 25. 2, Diod. 4. 9, Euseb. *prep. ev.* 2. 19, Lyc. *Al.* 1327 f., Tzetz. in Lyc. *Al.* 39, Hyg. *poet. astr.* 2. 43. Cp. *Brit. Mus. Cat. Gk. Vases* iv. 60 no. F 107, Gerhard *Etruskische Spiegel* iii. 125 pl. 126, v. 72 ff. pl. 59, 60, and the literature cited in Roscher *Lex.* i. 2130, 22 ff., 2222, 11 ff.

¹¹ Eratosth. *cat.* 3. 44, Tzetz. in Lyc. *Al.* 1327, 1350, Geopon. 11. 19. 1. So of Hermes, Mart. *Cap.* 1. 34, *Myth. Vat.* 3. 9. 2 p. 233 Mai.

¹² Diod. 4. 39, Lyc. *Al.* 39 with Tzetz. *ad loc.*

the case with any other figure whatsoever in the whole pantheon of Greece and Italy—a fact certainly not due to mere enthusiasm for athletics.

I have elsewhere¹ attempted to show that

nean monarchs traced their lineage back to Herakles⁴ and consequently by way of regalia wore a lion-skin over their heads.⁵ 'Ηρακλειδης was tantamount to 'Ηρακλῆς.⁶ Hence on the sarcophagus of Sidon Alexander



FIG. 4.

by the early Greeks Zeus was believed to be embodied in the reigning king, originally the strong man of the district, Tzetzes being substantially right when he said Δίας γὰρ πρὶν οἱ Ἕλληνες τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἐκάλουν.² The question therefore arises—Was Herakles too incarnate in human kings?³ The Macedo-

the Great appears with a lion-skin helmet;⁷ and it is probable that the head of Herakles

p. 391, cp. Hesych. s.v. βοῶπις); and the life of kings in general was 'Ηραία ζωή (Eudoc. viol. 435, Eustath. 81, 38).

⁴ Curt. 4. 2. 3.

⁵ Const. Porph. de praefectura 2. p. 22 (= Corp. script. Byz. iii. 48, 14 ff.).

⁶ Pausanias ap. Eustath. 1593, 14, cp. 989, 48, states that Herakles was also called 'Ηρακλειδης. Cp. Menand. fab. inc. frag. 319 Meineke ἀλλ' 'Ηρακλειδῆαι καὶ θεοὶ with Meineke ad loc. = Phot. lex. s.vv. 'Ηράκλεις and 'Ηρακλειδης.

⁷ Collignon Hist. sculpt. grecq. ii. 404 fig. 215.

¹ Folk-lore xv. 299 ff., 382 ff., cp. ib. xvi. 285 ff.
² Tzetz. chil. 5. 454, cp. ib. 1. 474, 2. 160, 174, 197, 9. 454, antehom. 102, in Lyc. Al. 88.

³ As Perikles was Zeus (Folk-lore xv. 302), so Aspasia was Hera (Plut. v. Per. 24. schol. Plat.

on coins of the Macedonian dynasty symbolised the kings themselves.¹ Alexander not only compared his own exploits to those of Herakles,² but used often to appear in public with lion-skin and club,³ and actually gave the name Herakles to his son by Barsine.⁴ Argive kings too were Herakleids: and Nikostratos of Argos, a man of Herculean strength, used to masquerade in battle as Herakles with lion-skin and club complete.⁵ He assumed the name Herakles and was dubbed ἔρερος Ἡρακλῆς by Ephippos.⁶ Themison of Cyprus, the favourite of Antiochus II., also had a lion-skin, a Scythian bow and a club: he was presented to the people on festal days as Herakles; and men sacrificed to him as Ἡρακλεῖ Θεμίῳνι.⁷ Among the Romans, Agrippa wears a lion-skin on a coin.⁸ Caligula sometimes pretended to be Hercules.⁹ Nero wanted to club or throttle a lion in the arena;¹⁰ and the populace paid their respects Νέρωνι τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ.¹¹ On the Via Appia was a temple in which stood a statue of Hercules with the features of Domitian.¹² Hercules appears on a medallion with the features of Hadrian.¹³ Commodus was worshipped as Hercules¹⁴ and represented as such on statues¹⁵ and on coins.¹⁶ With his club and lion-skin he wore the clothing of a woman.¹⁷ Septimius Severus has a lion-skin head-dress on a medallion.¹⁸ A statue in the Vatican shows Julia Domna as Omphale.¹⁹ Caracalla refused to be called Hercules,²⁰ unlike Maximinus I.²¹ Gallienus, Postumus, Probus, and Maximianus, all wear the lion-skin on

their coins.²² Maximianus was in fact renamed Heraclius and described as Hercules.²³ Constantius I. was also named Herculeus.²⁴ Indeed, Varro had long since declared that in olden days 'all doers of brave deeds were called Hercules.'²⁵ Nevertheless these examples of a human Hercules are comparatively late. Our search for the incarnate partner of Hera must proceed along other lines.²⁶

Now Herakles was not only the chief of ancient heroes: he was *the* hero *par excellence*—witness the glosses ἥρωα τὸν Ἡρακλῆα²⁷ and Ἡρακλῆς ὁ ἥρωας.²⁸ Further, the combination ἥρωας Ἡρακλῆς²⁹ reminds us that ἥρωας is in all probability from the same root as Ἥρα and Ἡρακλῆς.³⁰ Lastly, the word ἥρωας according to Aristotle³¹ meant οἱ ἡγεμόνες τῶν ἀρχαίων, while Istros³² asserted μόνους τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἥρωας λέγεσθαι. In view of these facts I would suggest that in early days the divine partner of Hera was Herakles, who was incarnate in the king or chief as ἥρωας. Thus Herakles would have a twofold aspect, divine and human. This suits the distinction drawn by Herodotus, who, after declaring that Herakles was an ancient god, proceeds: 'And those Hellenes in my opinion are acting most rightly who have established a double ritual of Herakles; to him as immortal and a so-called Olympian they make a burnt offering (θύουσι), to him as a hero they devote their sacrifice (ἐναγίζουσι).'³³ The same distinction is drawn by

¹ B. I. Wheeler *Alexander the Great* pp. xiii f., G. Macdonald *Coin Types* p. 151.

² Curt. 9. 2. 29, Strab. 171, Sen. de ben. 1. 13. 1 ff., 7. 3. 1, cp. 94. 63, Sen. suaz. 1. 1.

³ Athen. 537 F.

⁴ Niese *Gesch. d. griech. u. mak. Staaten* i. 191, 306 f., ii. 693.

⁵ Diod. 16. 44. Cp. Ar. ran. 428 ff. with schol. 501 on Kallias son of Hipponikos.

⁶ Athen. 289 B. ⁷ Id. ib. 289 F f.

⁸ A. de Longpérier in *Rev. num.* N.S. 1862 pp. 32 ff.

⁹ Cass. Dio 59. 26. ¹⁰ Suet. Nero 53.

¹¹ Cass. Dio 63. 20.

¹² Mart. 9. 64, 9. 65, 9. 101.

¹³ Fröhner, *Les méd. de l'emp. rom.* p. 41.

¹⁴ Lampr. *Comm.* 8 f., cp. 17, *Ant. Diad.* 7, Spart. *Ant. Car.* 5, Athen. 537 F, Cass. Dio 72. 15, cp. 72. 7, 72. 20, 72. 22, Herodian 1. 14 f., Dessau 400.

¹⁵ Lampr. *Comm.* 9. 2, Reinach *Rép. Stat.* i. 592, 3, ii. 583. 7.

¹⁶ Stevenson *Dict. Rom. Coins* pp. 450, 459, Macdonald *Coin Types* pp. 210 f., *Brit. Mus. Cat. Gk. Coins Alexandria* p. 176 pl. 6, 1411.

¹⁷ Lampr. *Comm.* 9. 6, Herodian 1. 14. 8.

¹⁸ Cohen *Septime Sévère, Caracalla et Plautille* 1.

¹⁹ Reinach *Rép. Stat.* i. 593, 3.

²⁰ Spart. *Ant. Car.* 5, Cass. Dio 77. 5.

²¹ Jul. Cap. *Maz. duo* 4, 6.

²² De Witte *De quelques empereurs romains qui ont pris les attributs d'Hercule* Paris 1845 pp. 268 f.; 340, 361; 272; 272 f.

²³ Cl. Mamert. *gen. Max.* 10. 5, 14. 4, 16. 2, cp. 3.6, Duruy *Hist. Rome* vi. 539, Dessau 622, 632, 634, 659, 670.

²⁴ Cohen *Constance I Chlore* 54.

²⁵ Varro ap. Serv. in Verg. *Aen.* 8. 564. Myth. Vat. 3. 13. 8 p. 274 Mai. On Herakles as king of Egypt see Syncell. 18 c (*F. H. G.* ii. 531).

²⁶ Annianus in his supposititious work Xenophon *de aequivocis* says: Saturni dicuntur familiarum nobilium regum, qui urbes condiderunt, senissimi. primogeniti eorum Ioves, et Iunones. Hercules vero nepotes eorum fortissimi. . . idem quoque qui unis populis est Hercules, alteris est Iuppiter. nam Ninus qui Chaldaeis extitit Hercules fuit Assyriis Iuppiter (see Berosus *antiq. libr. quinque* ed. 1612 p. 109). Had Annianus any authority to go upon, or was it merely a brilliant guess?

²⁷ Hesych. ed. min.² pp. 703 f. Schmidt = Kyrillos *Lex.* 171. ²⁸ *Et. mag.* 435, 4.

²⁹ Ap. Rhod. 2. 969.

³⁰ Prellwitz *Etym. Wörterb.* p. 177, Roscher *Lex.* i. 2094 n., 2441 f. ³¹ Arist. *probl.* 19. 48.

³² Istros ap. schol. *Il.* 2. 110, 13. 629, 15. 230, 19. 34, cp. 12. 165. Cp. Hes. *O.D.* 126 γέρας βασιλῆιον of the δαίμονες. . . ἐσθλοὶ ἐπιχθόνιοι.

³³ Hdt. 2. 44, cp. Plut. *de mal. Hdt.* 13. On θύουσι and ἐναγίζουσι see Miss Harrison *Profl. to Gk. Rel.* pp. 55 ff.

Pausanias, who states that Phaistos found the Sikyonians worshipping Herakles as a hero and bade them worship him as a god.¹ Similarly Diodorus says that Menoitios showed the people of Ópus how to honour Herakles as a hero—a practice adopted also by the Thebans, but that the Athenians set the example of sacrificing to him as a god.² Pindar combines both beliefs, when he speaks of Herakles as ἥρωος θεός;³ and the schol. vet. *ad loc.* records the oracle that bade the Greeks worship Herakles *τὴν μὲν ὡς ἥρωα, τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ ὡς θεόν*.

It may here be objected that, if ἥρωος means an incarnate Herakles, we should expect to find the former like the latter closely related to Hera. But that is exactly what we do find. Isidore,⁴ following Augustine,⁵ has preserved the Greek tradition that Ἥρα had a son Ἥρωος, and that all ἥρωες, *i.e.* the souls of the great dead, derive their name from her. This remarkable testimony is not lightly to be set aside. It explains *e.g.* the intimacy between the 'hero' Jason and his protectress Hera.⁶ As the representative of Zeus dwelt beneath the sacred oak (Dodona, Ammonium, etc.)⁷ or was known as the mistletoe-man (Ixion),⁸ so the favourite of Hera travels in a ship made of a wood resembling the mistletoe-bearing oak and takes with him a branch of the Dodonaean tree.⁹

Two questions remain. When, and where, did the *τερός γάμος* of Zeus and Hera take place? Zeus at Dodona was a Pelasgian god,¹⁰ whose cult had come from a Pelasgian district of Thessaly.¹¹ An epigrammatist on Memnon's left leg rightly speaks of the Dodonaean Zeus as Διὸς [Πελασγί]κοῦ.¹² Herodotus virtually states that Hera and the heroes were worshipped by the Pelasgians.¹³ Certainly Hera the patroness of Iason was a Pelasgian goddess,¹⁴ as was Hera at Samos.¹⁵ Propertius rightly speaks

of *Iunonis Pelasgae*.¹⁶ It is therefore possible, indeed it is probable, that the union of Zeus with Hera goes back to Pelasgian times.¹⁷ I conceive that a matriarchal Pelasgian tribe worshipping Hera and Herakles was amalgamated with a patriarchal Pelasgian tribe worshipping Zeus and Dia or Dione, the resultant cult being that of Zeus and Hera. The *τερός γάμος* is traditionally localised in Euboea,¹⁸ Boeotia,¹⁹ Argolis,²⁰ Samos,²¹ or Knossos,²² *i.e.* in the chief centres of Pelasgian civilisation.²³

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

LECHAT'S ATTIC SCULPTURE BEFORE PHIDIAS.

La Sculpture attique avant Phidias. By H. LECHAT. Pp. viii + 510. 48 Text-illustrations. Paris: A. Fontemoing. 1904. Fr. 20.

THAT M. Lechat has been able to devote a work of more than 500 closely printed pages to Attic sculpture before the time of Pheidias, is in itself significant of the advance that has been made by excavation and research in our knowledge of the earlier phases of Greek art. To this result no writer has given more ungrudging labour than M. Lechat, who, in virtue of his book *Au Musée de l'Acropole d'Athènes*, his articles in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, and the *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, and the substantial volume now under consideration, has come to be the authoritative exponent of the treasures of the little museum on the Acropolis.

The first section covers roughly a period of one hundred years, from B.C. 650 to B.C. 550, though the anterior date cannot be more than approximately accurate. M. Lechat is a firm believer in the autochthonous

¹ Paus. 2. 10. 1.

² Diod. 4. 39.

³ Pind. *Nem.* 3. 38.

⁴ Isid. *origg.* 8. 11. 98.

⁵ Aug. *de civ. Dei* 10. 21.

⁶ Od. 12. 72, Ap. Rhod. 3. 66 ff., *alib.*

⁷ *Folk-lore* xv. 295 ff.

⁸ *Ib.* xv. 425 f.

⁹ *Ib.* xv. 424.

¹⁰ *Il.* 16. 233, with schol. *ad loc.*, Eustath. 1057, 42, 51 ff., Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Δωδώνη, Eudoc. *viol.* 414 g.

¹¹ Strab. 329.

¹² Kaibel *ep.* 995. 9.

¹³ Hdt. 2. 50. Temenos, son of Pelasgos, erected three temples to Hera at Stymphalos (Paus. 8. 22. 2).

¹⁴ Ap. Rhod. 1. 14, with schol. *ad loc.*

¹⁵ Dionys. *per.* 534, with Eustath. *ad loc.*

¹⁶ Prop. 2. 28. 11.

¹⁷ It is to be noted that in an Athenian myth, which Gruppe (*Gr. Myth.* p. 904 n.) regards as Pelasgian, Hymenaeus the marriage-god is apparently clothed as a woman (Serv. in Verg. *Aen.* 4. 99).

¹⁸ Mt. Ocha (Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Κάρυστος); Elym-nion (schol. Ar. *pac* 1126).

¹⁹ Mt. Kithairon (Euseb. *prep. ev.* 3. 1. 3).

²⁰ Mt. Kokkx or Kokkygion (*F.H.G.* ii. 190 f. Aristot. *frag.* 287 ap. schol. vet. Theocr. 15. 64 = Eudoc. *viol.* 414 h., Paus. 2. 17. 4, cp. 2. 36. 1 f.).

²¹ Varro ap. Lact. *div. inst.* 1. 17. 8, Aug. *de civ. Dei* 6. 7, schol. *Il.* 14. 296, Eustath. 987, 7 ff.

²² Diod. 5. 72. In Ptolem. *nov. hist.* 6 p. 196, 11 ff. Westermann the union takes place in the cave of Achilles the Earth-born.

²³ See Ridgeway *The Early Age of Greece* i. chapters 1 and 2.

nature of Attic art. It is perhaps inevitable that the absorbed study of one set of facts tends to their detachment from their surroundings, but there is an attractive chivalry in the author's championship of the pure descent of the ladies of the Acropolis. 'Quant à la sculpture attique,' he writes, 'elle n' a dû qu'à elle-même sa première croissance: elle est totalement coupée, dans l'espace, des sculptures égyptienne ou assyrienne; totalement coupée, dans le temps, de l'art des pré-Hellènes. Elle nous apparaît, prise à ses débuts, comme autochtone.' Of the poros pediments the author, in opposition to Dr. Wiegand who considers them contemporary works, attempts an elaborate chronological sequence. He treats at great length the question of early polychromy summarizing his conclusions as to its origin as follows. 'La polychromie dans la sculpture grecque n'a été, à l'origine, qu'une satisfaction donnée aux exigences d'un sens esthétique qui manquait encore de culture: elle n'est pas le résultat laborieux d'un calcul artistique, mais le fruit spontané d'un instinct: c'est à cet instinct qu'elle doit son existence, et c'est par cet instinct qu'a été déterminée sa façon d'être.'

The second section covers the period of Ionian influence. M. Lechat emphasizes the point that the earliest marble works 'n'ont différé des sculptures en pierre commune que par la matière, mais non par l'aspect extérieur et par les qualités d'exécution.' Of this period he considers the *Moscophoros* the most important and the most typical. In the decade following the middle of the sixth century he argues that Attic art had a well-established character of its own, holding the balance between Dorian and Ionian. 'Il semble que l'art attique soit dirigé, dès ses débuts, par un secret instinct de mesure qui le préserve des excès choquants et des étalages agressifs, et le conduit à occuper un juste milieu entre l'art de la Grèce orientale et celui de la Grèce occidentale.' He places a few years later the change due to Ionian influence reaching Attica by the island school of Chios and culminating in the time of the Peisistratids. 'Aux raisons d'ordre géographique et ethnique aux prédispositions de milieu et de mœurs qui désignaient l'Attique pour être plus aisément imprégnée d'ionisme, s'ajoutaient les effets de la politique des Pisistratides à l'extérieur comme à l'intérieur.' To this period he assigns the majority of the long series of the Acropolis korai, devoting to them the minute and assiduous study with which readers of his

articles in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* are already in part familiar.

The concluding section is devoted to the growth of the other cogent factor in pre-Pheidian sculpture, the influence of Dorian art. The genesis of this should receive fresh light from the excavations now in progress on the site of ancient Sparta, but under whatever conditions it arose the familiar notion that at Athens it existed side by side with the earlier Ionian strain, the two acting and reacting upon each other, will probably need no modification. And we are still probably right in considering that of these two factors Pheidian art is the outcome and the synthesis. 'Cette harmonieuse conciliation,' our author concludes, 'est plus complète encore dans les sculptures de Parthénon où elle va sans effort jusqu'à une intime pénétration réciproque des éléments contraires.'

When due consideration has been paid to the author's erudition it remains to be said that the work, owing to its inordinate length and inadequate illustrations, is in its present form an unattractive volume. There are it is true some fair reproductions of the less well known subjects, but most of the works of art described are now familiar, and quite small cuts of these would have been sufficient to recall to the reader the precise poros pediment or kore under discussion. As it is, two-thirds of the work is unintelligible outside a library.

JOHN H. BAKER-PENOYRE.

ROBERTS' AND GARDNER'S GREEK EPIGRAPHY.

An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy.
Part II.: The Inscriptions of Attica.
Edited by E. S. ROBERTS, M.A., and
E. A. GARDNER, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1905. Pp. xxiv + 602. 21s.

THE review of this scholarly book has been delayed too long. I welcomed the task when offered me, but kept waiting for leisure quietly to study these pages, with the enjoyment which comes always from visiting old scenes in new and enlightened companionship. Such anticipations have been amply fulfilled. The volume is a monument of exact and sedulous labour, such as Cambridge scholarship has taught us to expect; and it enables the English student to bring his information upon Attic epigraphy up to the level of the best knowledge.

The First Part, published by Mr. Roberts in 1887, dealt mainly with the history of the Greek alphabets in the period ending with the closing years of the fifth century B.C., and was illustrated by inscriptions from all parts of the Greek world. The volume before us has a different scope. It is confined to Attica, and is the outcome of a study of all the vast and multitudinous mass of Attic inscriptions as yet discovered. The editors have set before us specimens of every kind of document,—public or private, secular or sacred,—embraced within that wide compass. They explain to us the peculiarities of orthography, syntax, and even of lettering, both as indications of date and as phases in the development of the language. They also make the documents they publish reveal their secrets, and unfold the history—social or political—of the period to which they belong.

Few persons are really aware of the vast dimensions to which Greek epigraphy has by this time grown. It presents quite as wide and varied material for study as Greek literature itself. In fact the two—inscriptions and manuscripts—are really the complements of each other; the qualities required for the one branch of research are those which serve for the other. And it is worth observing how generally the scholars that have done most for epigraphy have also been distinguished in other fields of intellectual activity. Augustus Böckh, who first reduced the study of Greek inscriptions to a science and compiled his monumental *Corpus*, wrote also the *Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, and was a distinguished editor of Pindar. Adolf Kirchhoff, who planned the new Berlin *Corpus* and trained the younger school of epigraphists, was a notable lecturer on Aeschylus. Much the same might be said of his brilliant disciple, Ulrich Köhler, whose scholarship made the *Mittheilungen* of the German School at Athens famous. In Austria, Otto Benndorf was not only a careful epigraphist, but confessedly one of the ablest and most original Greek scholars of his time. In France, Dumont, the epigraphist, became a successful Minister of Education. Waddington, who did more than any man for the epigraphy and numismatics of Asia Minor, was best known as the French Ambassador. And the editors of this volume, minute students as they are of epigraphy, are both men distinguished for their great and varied services to learning and education. The very mention of these names (and the list could easily be extended) illustrates a real

difficulty in epigraphic study. Its field has become so great as to compel subdivision of labour, and limitations of area. Well do I remember spending two days in the *temenos* of Delphi, shortly after it had been cleared by the French explorers under M. Homolle. Apart from the indescribable interest of the remains of architecture and sculpture, there were (it seems) whole acres of new inscriptions to be read. It was as if one had entered a vast library, full of books uncatalogued, unread, unopened. The material in fact at hand for study, from every part of Greece, is enormous; and it is fast increasing. If to inscriptions be added the Greek papyri now so rapidly being published, we may say of the last half-century, that Greek learning has received accessions of material, enlargement in breadth of view and in thoroughness of method, without any parallel since the re-discovery of Greek. It is a privilege to have had any share, however small, in this new revival, and the present writers have deserved well of the republic of letters.

My only fear is that they have crowded too much within the compass of the volume. They have hardly left themselves space enough to set the documents plainly before the reader. The book is avowedly meant for beginners, and the untrained eye might be thankful for the light and leading afforded by more frequent and emphatic headings and plainer indications of date. One marvels at the compact and careful arrangement of material; but in reading, I have felt a sense of oppression. One wants more elbow-room. The student might sometimes hardly be able to see the wood for the trees. The brevity observed in matters of reference at times breeds obscurity. On p. 36 I hardly saw at first what was meant by 'Ro. i. 145 45'; nor did I recognize myself in 'H. 39,' especially as neither work is mentioned in the list of abbreviations on pp. xix., xx. If it be not presumptuous, I would say that the volume would have been hardly less interesting, if its scope had been chiefly confined to philology; if it had aimed at illustrating such works as those of Wecklein, Larfeld, and Meisterhans on the Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, just as Part I. illustrated Kirchhoff's remarkable study of the Greek alphabets.

However, the editors have given us far more, and we can but be grateful for their bounty. The student who masters this volume will know something, by selected samples, of all that Attic inscriptions have to teach about history, antiquities, and language.

Interesting documents abound, so that one knows not where to begin. On p. 9 we read the authentic history of the lovely little Temple of Victory which charms every visitor to the Acropolis. On p. 70 we read part of the name of Alcibiades in a contemporary decree, and on p. 309 find a list of his confiscated effects. On p. 91 we are enabled to correct the historians by help of the marbles. On pp. 54 and 262 we have to explain why the text of Thucydides varies from the inscribed text of a decree, and are helped by the editors to do so. Few things will come home to the modern reader more than the account of the consulting of the oracle on p. 96, or the specifications for the Arsenal of Philo on p. 364. The notes are excellent. Nothing could be better than the paragraph (*e.g.*) on the *phratries* (p. 229), save that one could wish it rather longer; or that on the *Ephelia* (p. 145), into which a whole chapter of Attic history is condensed. Few will quarrel with the conclusions drawn from documents (p. 33) as to the identification of the *Opisthodomos*. Bright little suggestions lighten our path through dull places again and again, as on p. 302, where in explanation of Ἀφροδισιακόν, Δημητριάκόν, Ἀθηναϊκόν, etc., as names for workings (ἐργαστήρια) in the mines of Laureion, the editors say: 'the names may have commemorated a vow or denoted neighbouring shrines.' On p. 180 in a good note upon Diogenes, the hero of the later Ephebi, it would have been well to quote also Köhler's original essay in an early volume of the *Mittheilungen* where he identified this personage as 'Ein Verschollener.'

It must be confessed that, as a rule, the interest of Attic documents shrinks greatly after we enter the second half of the fourth century. The earlier decrees, and indeed all the earlier Attic documents, are of imperishable value. But the later Attic inscriptions deal with subjects which are often more vividly illustrated by documents from other regions. The fact is, that while Athens was declining in political and commercial importance, other places, such as Rhodes, Cos, Halicarnassos, Delos, and many other towns and islands of the Levant, were entering upon a vigorous career, or even becoming important centres of art and letters. Athens affords us no example of Dikast decrees, nor anything like the famous sumptuary law from Gambreion which limits the expenses of funerals and reminds of some of Solon's rules. The best illustration of the sale of a priesthood and the specification of its perquisites is the inscription from

Halicarnassos cited on p. 232. The melting down and reconstruction of valuable *ex voto* offerings in a temple is best exemplified by the inscription from the Amphiarion at Oropos quoted on p. 360. The best ritual decrees are from Cos. So that, on the whole, I should incline to think that the best way of breaking up our unwieldy material into manageable portions and making its evidence available to the student, will be by dealing with separate aspects in separate monographs, and by making the subject and not the locality the principle of division. Scholars like Dittenberger and Michel have done all that can be done in the way of general selections. Larfeld, Meisterhans, and others have dealt with the grammar of inscriptions. Haussoullier and his colleagues have collected the documents that relate to law; Loewy those that deal with sculptors; Cauer and others have illustrated dialects; Swoboda has written on Greek decrees. Many other such monographs have appeared, and will appear. I had long desired to issue a volume of inscriptions to illustrate Greek Religion, and I hope some younger scholar will take up the task: I will gladly hand him my notes. Only in this kind of way do I think that the great task before us can be properly mastered. I am not for a moment disparaging the work of these two scholars: they have attacked an immense task, and I wonder at the success they have achieved.

On a few points I should venture to suggest a doubt or a difference of view. On p. 37 the authors hardly seem to have perceived how early, how strongly, and how lastingly Athens was possessed by the fatal ambition to extend her Empire in the West. The colonizing of Thurii, the support of Corcyra, the alliance with Rhegium and Leontini, were all steps in that policy of Western expansion which led to the Sicilian Expedition and the irreparable ruin of Athens. On p. 51, I cannot think that ἐπαινεῖται in the decrees is an 'imperative' use of the infinitive; it depends on ἔδοξε or a like word expressed or understood. On p. 500 it would have been better to print the famous epitaph on the Potidaean heroes in three quatrains, as their author manifestly intended.

I had noted a number of other points for mention, but space forbids. The volume is packed with interesting things, and it closes (*mirabile dictu*) with an inscription—surely once the property of a teacher—which prescribed an early system of shorthand. There is a capital index.

EDWARD LEE HICKS.

FRAZER'S *EARLY HISTORY OF THE KINGSHIP*.

Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship. By J. G. FRAZER, Hon. D.C.L., Oxford, Hon. LL.D., Glasgow, Hon. Litt.D., Durham, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co., New York: The Macmillan Co. 1905. Pp. xi + 309. 8s. 6d. net.

THE remembrance of the lectures delivered by Dr. Frazer at Trinity College, in the Lent Term of 1905, is still fresh in the minds of many at Cambridge. These lectures are here reprinted substantially as spoken. They consist, we are told in the preface, of a series of extracts from the forthcoming third edition of *The Golden Bough*. Prompted largely by criticisms and suggestions made by Mr. A. B. Cook in his articles on 'Zeus Jupiter and the Oak' (*C.R.* 1903, 1904) Dr. Frazer has reconsidered the whole problem of the Arician kingship. The result has been not only that much light has been thrown on the peculiar ritual of Nemi but that Dr. Frazer has arrived at a theory of the origin of the kingship in general.

The king according to Dr. Frazer is the lineal descendant not of the 'strong man' of the tribe, but of the principal magician or medicine-man. By the dread he inspires, by the property he accumulates, the chief medicine-man gradually attains influence over his weaker brethren, influence mainly beneficent, because it stands for knowledge as against ignorance, expert skill as against brute force. The medicine-man with his perquisites is the first instance of the 'endowment of research.' But the medicine-man tends also to develop into a god; god and king are not to primitive man things sharply distinguishable; hence the divinity that 'doth hedge a king.'

Clear and convincing this and we long for the sequel. But, having named the word *magician* Dr. Frazer will not trust us to understand what is meant by *magic*, so three chapters are interpolated to explain 'sympathetic magic' with its two subdivisions 'Homeopathic' and 'Contagious' magic. Needless to say they are excellent chapters, happily combining amusement and instruction. They will be well in place, in the third edition of *The Golden Bough* and will then call for detailed consideration. But here we submit they tend to obscure the main contention.

The king then is half-god, half-magician: his main business is to make rain, to make

sun, to promote fertility generally. For this he needs a help-meet; hence the sacred ritual marriages all over the world; hence the King and Queen of the May; hence the Rex Nemorensis has his woman-counterpart in Diana Nemorensis. Direct evidence of a sacred marriage at Nemi, Dr. Frazer frankly owns (p. 169) there is none, but we think his contention is justified that 'analogy pleads in its favour.'

The king needs in modern, patriarchal parlance a help-meet, a Queen, but note that, if Dr. Frazer be right, this help-meet is a goddess 'Diana' wedded to a mortal king of the wood, mortal however hedged with divinity. This brings us to a curious and cardinal discovery, to our mind the most important new contribution to mythology made by the present book.

We all know Virgil's elaborate confusion or contamination of Virbius and Hippolytus. Diana revives the dead Hippolytus and sets him to dwell in Egeria's grove, there to spend an inglorious life

versoque ubi nomine Virbius esset.

Aen. vii. 777.

But what lies behind all this? The invaluable Servius tells us; yet his explanation, simple, illuminating as it is, once observed, escaped even Dr. Frazer in his earlier edition, *re vera autem . . . Virbius est numen conjunctum Dianae, ut Matri deum Atys Minervae Erichthonius; Veneri Adonis*. Virbius, Hippolytus,¹ Attis, Adonis, Erichthonius, and many another are *numina conjuncta* prince-consorts to goddesses, the King of the Woods was help-meet, prince-consort to Diana the Goddess-Queen.

But what evidence of this exists? Is it a mere 'matriarchal' hypothesis framed to account for mythology otherwise inexplicable? Not at all. We know now that man makes the gods in his own image. If then we assert that in countless instances the god was prince-consort to the goddess, we are bound to show evidence that in *human* affairs the king was prince-consort to the queen. This is just what for the early Italian kingships Dr. Frazer has brilliantly demonstrated. Here again we hope he will pardon us if we regret that this demonstration is seriously hampered by the inter-

¹ Dr. Frazer has elsewhere (in a paper published in the *Fortnightly Review*) examined the relation of Hippolytus as *numen conjunctum* to Artemis and has shown clearly I think that the relation of the ascetic to the maiden-goddess as we know it in the Phaedra-myth is a late development. The cult at the tomb of Hippolytus is in itself sufficient evidence.

polation of material only remotely relevant, we mean the sacrifice possibly with a view to marriage of women to water-spirits, the Perseus and Andromeda type and the, in itself, most interesting 'Privilege of St. Romain.' Needless to say that the thread of the argument is never lost by the writer, but for some readers we tremble.

The god is prince-consort to the goddess. Translated into terms of humanity this means kingship transmitted in the female line. Sudden significance is hereby given to the fact that not one of the Roman kings was immediately succeeded by his son, yet several left sons or grandsons. One, Ancus Martius, was descended from a former king through his mother not through his father, Tadius, the elder Tarquin, and Servius Tullius were succeeded by their sons-in-law of foreign descent. The succession to the kingship was determined, it would seem, in ancient Rome by customs such as those which have moulded many other early societies, customs known currently by the inaccurate term 'matriarchal,' by the custom *i.e.* of exogamy, *beena* marriage and female kinship. The royal princesses stay by the paternal hearth as Vestal Virgins, a prince of another house or even a stranger of low birth, but vigorous stock comes from without, approves himself by some deed of conquest or trial of strength, marries a princess and their child succeeds. This principle is frequently at work in heroic Greece. Aeacus reigns in Aegina, his son Telamon migrates to Salamis, marries the king's daughter and reigns there. Telamon's son Teucer, in like fashion, migrates to Cyprus, marries the king's daughter and succeeds his father-in-law. It is the same in the line of Peleus—Peleus himself, Achilles, Neoptolemos all seek other fortunes, fortunes abroad, so again with Pelops Atreus and Menelaos. Even Agamemnon according to the older lyric poets reigns not at Mycenae but in Clytaemnestra's native land of Lacedaemon and is buried at its ancient capital, Amyclae.

Such are the human social conditions reflected in the mythology of the *numina conjuncta* and we no longer wonder that Numa has his Egeria and the Rex Nemorensis his Diana Nemorensis. The King of the Wood fighting for his kingdom is the last survivor of heroes who wrestled and raced to obtain a bride and with her a kingdom. So Pelops won Hippodameia, Ulysses Penelope, Alcidas Barce.

The king, once king was, as we have seen, divine, the final question remains what divinity did the King of the Wood embody.

The male correlation of Diana is Dianus and Dianus is, if Dr. Frazer be right and we cannot doubt it, but our old friend Janus writ long, Juno Diana Dione are, in origin and substance, identical. Janus like Jupiter, like Zeus, is the father-god, Juno-Diana-Dione not maiden but mother. The door *janua* did not give its name to the god, but, as is more becoming, the god to the door, for in no Indo-European speech save Latin has door the name *janua*.

The riddle of the Nemi kingship is read, all honour to the reader. Dr. Frazer is eloquent on the importance of the inductive method—we all of us recommend the inductive method to our pupils—but the best of us is but a dog, he cannot hunt until he has got the scent. Dr. Frazer is also eloquent on the duty of dispassionate inquiry, yet his book *is*, his lectures *were*, informed, aglow with a passionate propagandism. The anthropologist is the patient pioneer, we are told of a new and surer social revolution. He and he only forces us to see with clear eyes the stuff of which our customs and creeds our gods and kings for better for worse are made.—The Rousseaus of the past have dreamed their dreams, the sleeper is turning in his sleep and at the touch of anthropology awakes at last to reality.

JANE E. HARRISON.

DECHARME'S GREEK CRITICISM OF TRADITIONAL RELIGION.

La Critique des Traditions Religieuses chez les Grecs, des origines au temps de Plutarque. Par PAUL DECHARME. Paris: Picard. 1904. 8vo. Pp. xiv + 518. Fr. 7.50.

THIS book is a pleasant change from Greek Mythologies on the German plan—collections of facts, full measure, pressed down and running over, so much pressed down in fact that they are hard to digest. M. Decharme takes Greek mythology and religion from the philosophical side. He takes the facts largely for granted, analyzes their elements, and describes the points of view of the great writers—Homer, Hesiod, Plato, and so forth. Greek mythology as it appeared to the Greeks is his theme. There is evidence in him of a certain bias: he is too much inclined, I think, to rationalize: thus the story of Cronos (p. 13) becomes a subtle allegory, and the War with the Titans suggests a volcanic eruption (p. 18). Homer's point of view is not, I think, apprehended.

The author says: 'on chercherait vainement dans l'Iliade et dans l'Odyssée les premières traces du scepticisme grec à l'égard des fables des dieux.' But Homer seems to be definitely a critic of these stories, at least in those parts where he pokes fun at the gods. European folk-tales often poke fun at devils and ogres, sometimes at saints, but never at God or Jesus Christ; and the Homeric poems show signs of this mocking spirit. Homer's criticism may well be implied in his silence as to such myths as that of Cronos. When we come to historical times, M. Decharme is more in his element. Here he deals separately with the Historians, the Poets, 'Philosophes, Sophistes, et impies' (whom he unkindly groups together), Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; he has chapters also on prosecutions for impiety (a good idea), and on the philosophical schools—the Academy, Epicurus, the Stoics, Pythagoras, with Euhemerism and realism. Lastly, a valuable account is given of Plutarch's religious views.

The chapters in which M. Decharme describes the attitude of educated men towards the Greek pantheon deserve the study of all who wish to understand the ancients. It is not easy for the average Christian to see how such men could keep any faith in their national religion; yet they did. The patronizing air which was common in discussing them thirty years ago is not so common now; but since Plato did not write a controversial treatise justifying the Greek religion against any other, and since his views are not aggressively put forward, they may be missed. Plutarch on the other hand, who lived after religious controversy had begun, formulates his own views clearly enough; but Plutarch is not generally studied. Those who are interested in the history of religious thought, and who are not biassed by prejudices, will welcome M. Decharme's analysis. Along with it they would do well to examine Minucius Felix. There is no doubt, in my opinion, that Christianity triumphed not for intellectual reasons but for moral; that the determining factor was the loss of faith, not intellectual difficulties, in other words that the educated Greek could find comfort in his own religion in spite of its inconsistencies and absurdities. The Greek is much the same now as he was in Plato's day: he has only changed the names of his gods.

M. Decharme has chosen his subjects well. The man of keen intellect and moral correctness probably takes the same views on the whole in ancient Greece and modern Eng-

land; and the chief types characteristic of ancient belief are fairly shown forth in the other chapters. We miss however both the Orphics and the Mithraists. Euhemerus is always with us; he even stands at the elbow of M. Decharme, as I have indicated above.

The book is delightful to read, and makes one marvel why so few English writers can escape the taint of the halfpenny press. Are there such things in France as—but perhaps it is better to name no names.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREECE.

Laconia.—At Thalamai on the W. Coast the spring near the sanctuary of Ino, mentioned by Pausanias (iii. 26. 1), has probably been identified. At Geronthrai a Bronze Age Settlement has been discovered, as well as a series of 6th–5th cent. marble sculptures of local work. At Angelona a Heroon has been excavated. Here were found an excellent marble relief of the 5th cent. representing a worshipper at an altar, a terracotta relief of an enthroned hero with kantharos and serpent, a bronze snake, and other objects.¹

Corinth.—During the past season the ground to the N. and E. of the so-called spring of Glauké has been thoroughly examined. Pottery fragments ranging in date from late Corinthian to *terra sigillata* have come to light. On the S. slope of the Acropolis the remains of the Asklepieion have been uncovered.

S. RUSSIA.

Kuban District.—Several tumuli have been explored, but the results as a whole are somewhat disappointing, most of the tombs having been previously rifled. The most noteworthy objects found are a bronze jug with a fine relief under the handle representing a male figure, and a bronze bowl with a relief of a youth wounded by an Erinny and supported by a woman. The relief is fine Hellenistic work of the 3rd–2nd cent. B.C.¹

EGYPT.

Elephantine.—Several ancient houses of the poorer sort have been excavated. Of the finds, the most considerable are papyri. Especially noteworthy is a series of docu-

¹ *Arch. Anz.* 1906, part 2.

ments sealed with very fine seals of the Ptolemaic Period, representing a head of Medusa, Eros shooting with the bow, Artemis with torch, etc. Many household utensils and much late pottery—Roman and Coptic—have been found.¹

Alexandria.—At Tach el Karamus in the Delta an important treasure of gold and silver objects has been found. These are now for the most part in the Cairo museum. They include an armlet, with richly decorated clasp surmounted by a figure of Eros holding his chlamys in his hands, another armlet in the form of a serpent with the eyes set with precious stones and a large ruby on its head, and a third armlet ending in the forepart of two winged sphinxes. There are also a chain necklace ending in the heads of lion-gryphons, and two gold pectorals ending above in hawk-heads ornamented with inlaid pearls, lapis lazuli, and turquoises. Several silver vessels were also found, the best of which is a silver-gilt rhyton ending in a gryphon's head. The find can be approximately dated by the coins of Ptolemy I and II discovered with it. It cannot be later than the 2nd half of the 3rd cent. B.C.¹

N. AFRICA.

Carthage.—The excavation of the theatre has led to the discovery of several statues, the most important being one of Aphrodite and Eros. On the hill of St. Monica a wall of amphorae has been discovered. They are stamped with inscriptions indicating the place of production and the name of the producer. Several Greek terracottas of the 4th–3rd cent. B.C. have been found, including a woman wearing a kalathos and holding a large round fan, and another woman wearing a curious variety of Phrygian cap.¹

Dugga.—A large wind-rose has been discovered, marked for twelve winds, viz. Septentrio, Aquilo, Euroaquilo, [Solanus], Eurus, Leuconotus, Auster, Libonotus, Africus, Favonius, Argestes, Circus.¹

F. H. MARSHALL.

NUMISMATIC SUMMARIES.

Revue numismatique. Part 2, 1906.

O. Vauvillé. 'Monnaies gauloises de Suessions à la légende Criciru.' Many of these coins (bronze, silver, and gold) were found at Pommiers near Soissons (*Noviodunum* of the *Suessiones*). Criciru

¹ *Arch. Anz.* 1906, part 2.

is probably the name of the chieftain of the tribe.—Dieudonné. 'Émèse.' Coins of Emisa (*Homs*) in Syria. An interesting summary of its coinage under Elagabalus and other Emperors. Lenormant published a bronze coin on which he read *Dabel Malka*, and which he assigned to one of the regal high-priests of this city. Dieudonné doubts the reading, and even the attribution to Emisa. Some coins, of the Antioch type, period of Caracalla, hitherto assigned to Heliopolis, are, it is suggested, of Emisa. They have as mint-symbol a radiate head, the Sun-God.—J. De Foville. 'Trois monnaies d'or romaines.' One of these pieces—recent acquisitions of the French Collection—is an aureus of Allectus found in France, near Samer, south of Boulogne-sur-Mer. The coin is of the London mint, ML, but the type of the rev. (*Provid. Aug.*) is new in gold and is not found in Mr. Webb's recent monograph.—E. Babelon. 'La trouvaille de Helleville (Manche) en 1780.' An interesting account of a find, made long ago in Normandy, of gold medallions and rare gold coins of Constantine I. and his family. These pieces were acquired for the French Collection, but at the time of the great robbery in 1831 were melted down by the plunderers, and shared the shocking fate of 2,000 other gold specimens of ancient currency. Babelon's descriptions and photographs are taken from plaster casts of the originals which have been fortunately preserved. This paper includes some remarks (pp. 183 f.) on the use of the *nimbus* on Roman coins; on the employment of the gemmed diadem; also, on large gold medallions (pp. 185 f.) given by the Emperors as presents to barbarian princes, and which have generally been found in places far from the chief cities of the Empire.

Rivista italiana di numismatica. Part 2, 1906.

Contains several articles on Roman numismatics, among which may be mentioned the continuation of Haebler's article on *aes grave*; F. Gnechi on the aurei of Probus and Gallienus inscribed *UBIQUE PAX*; G. Pansa, 'Le monete dei Peligni,' on coins inscribed *PALACNVS*, etc.; M. Piccione, 'Le due F dell'aureo di M. Antonio Figlio.'

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Vol. xxv. Part 4, 1906.

G. F. Hill. 'Nochmals das Stabkreuz.' As to the 'staff' held by Nike on coins of Alexander the Great, etc. This object has been usually called a trophy-stand, but Babelon has seen in it the *styli* (part of a ship). Assmann has recently declared it to be a standard used on Phoenician ships. Mr. Hill agrees that the object is 'of a nautical character,' 'probably some kind of standard,' but he shows that it does not closely resemble (as Assmann asserted) the standards found on Phoenician coins (Sidon, Aradus). The cruciform standard now in question resembles the object carried by Nike on a Panathenaic vase of B.C. 336, and 'there can be no doubt that this form of standard was known in Greece at least as early as 336 B.C., whether it was of Phoenician origin or not.'—H. Dessau. 'Die Entstehung der Aeren von Gangra und Amasia.' Year 1 of the era of Gangra (according to inscriptions, etc.) begins in the autumn of B.C. 6 and ends autumn of B.C. 5. The first year of the era of Amasia is supposed by Th. Reinach to be 1–2 A.D. The evidence of a coin of Caracalla is discussed by Dessau, who maintains (like Imhoof-Blumer) that the era began in B.C. 2. The eras of Sebastopolis (p. 379) and Sebastea (p. 342) are also referred to.

Numismatic Chronicle. Part 2, 1906.

G. Macdonald. 'Roman medallions in the Hunterian Collection.' A descriptive account of the medallions (Hadrian to Valens) illustrated by four plates. At the end of each description are placed a couple of arrow-heads, novel, but not unimportant appendages to a numismatic article, as they are intended to show the 'direction in which obv. and rev. dies have lain during the process of striking.' I may add that Mr. Macdonald has a paper on this subject of the direction of dies in the forthcoming volume of essays written in honour of

B. V. Head.—P. H. Webb. 'The Coinage of Allectus.' A much more complete list of the coins than any previously published. 'Allectus coined some 18 varieties of gold coinage and a large amount of bronze, but no true silver.' On p. 137 an explanation of the mint-letters is attempted, e.g. M.S.C = Moneta Signata Camulodunensis (Colchester mint); M.L. = Moneta Londinensis; S.P. = Signata prima officina. For the further discussion of these difficult points, Mr. Webb's catalogue will provide useful material.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. 30. 1906. No. 1.

Græco-Egyptian deeds of divorce, Jean Lesquier. The papyri, which are studied in detail, are formal business documents: they do not throw any light upon the grounds for divorce in Greek Egypt. *The law of the antepenultimate foot in the text of Terence*, Georges Romain. The law posited for Plautus (see C.R. p. 382) is maintained for Terence, and infractions of it considered. *The Lucian Lexicon*, Pierre Bourdreaux. The inaccuracies of Bachmann's account of this in his *Anecdota Græca* are exposed in detail. *On some passages of Cicero's Letters to Atticus* (Books 9 and 12), Max Bonnet. Emendations of 9. 10. 7, 12. 3. 1, 12. 11, 12. 18. 1, 12. 25. 2, 12. 40. 2, 12. 45. 2. *On Juvenal* 1. 105, the same. *Quadringenta* refers to the equestrian fortune. *Rutiliana*, J. Vessereau and P. Dimoff. I. Rutilius was probably born at or near Narbonne. II. The date of his journey was 417 A.D. (=1169 of Rome by the reckoning of Cato). *Bulletin bibliographique*.

No. 2.

History of the Greek Language and Literature. Introduction, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Translation of the beginning of *Die griechische Literatur und Sprache* by Mme. J. Weil. *The text of Q. Curtius and metrical prose*, René Pichon. Numerous passages are cited. For a historian C. keeps curiously close to the rules of metrical prose. *The δίκη ἐξούλης in Attic Law*, R. Dareste. Considered with special reference to Plautus *Rud.* 859. *Hirtius B.G.* 8. 4. 1, L. Havet. For tot read tota. *Aetna*, Georges Romain. Emendations of 65 leg. 'stant utrimque truces,' 119, 395. *Facsimile of an inscription from the Praetor. Tertullian de Idololatria* 8, Aug. Audollent. *Meilichides' Delian accounts*, A. Dieudonné. Transcript, with facsimile and comments, of an inscription in the 'Cabinet des Médailles' (No. LXII in Homolle's catalogue of inscriptions in *Archives de l'Intendance sacrée à Délos*). *The Commentariolum in Artem Eutycii of Scdalius Scottus*, M. Roger. *On the authenticity of two poems of Fortunatus de exordio Thuringiae and Epist. ad Artachin, wrongly attributed to St. Rudegund*, E. Rey. *Orphica περί Αἰθρας*, v. 227 (Abel), C.-E. Ruelle. Read τὸν δέ for τὸν δέ. *Tertullian ad uxorem*, 1. 4, R. de Labriolle. *Pomponius Mela* 3. 52, L. Havet. *An archaic inscription of Cumae*, B. Haussoullier. *Bulletin bibliographique. Revue des Revues*.

No. 3.

Fragments of an unknown Greek philosopher or rhetorician, J. Bidez. A mutilated papyrus, No. CCLXXV of the British Museum, is published and restored. *Phaedrus* 3. 4. 6-7, L. Havet. For et—et read ut—ita. *Studies on Terence's Eunuchus*, the same. Thirty-four pages of criticisms on the text of the first 300 lines. *A commonplace of the Second Sophistic*, Louis Méridier. *Lucian's ἡγομένων διδασκαλος* § 18 is a fling at the Panathenaica of Aelius Aristides. *Horace and Tibullus*, A. Cartault. *Hor. Ep.* 1. 4 (referred, like *Carm.* 1. 33, to Tibullus) is interpreted to mean: 'Have you gone into retreat to write poor epics like those of Cassius Parmensis? Better obey the natural promptings of your heart and return to a life of pleasure.' In the last line *videre* is used in the sense of 's'amuser.' Speculations on Tibullus iv. 13 conclude the paper. *The works of Petilianus, Donatist bishop of Constantina*, Paul Monceaux. The text of the letter 'ad presbyteros et diaconos Donatistas adversus Catholicam' is put together from the polemic in St. Augustine. *Bulletin bibliographique. Revue des Revues*.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie. 1906.

4 July. G. Macdonald, *Catalogue of Greek coins in the Hunterian Collection. III. Further Asia, Northern Africa, Western Greece* (H. v. Fritze). Fr. Seiler, *Griechische Fahrten und Wanderungen* (O. Weissenfels), favourable. Th. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften. I. 2. Juristische Schriften*, 2. Band (E. Kornemann). W. Wagner, *Röm. Geschichte der römischen Völker und seiner Kultur*. 8. Aufl. von O. E. Schmidt (R. Oehler). Der illustrierte lateinische *Aesop* in der Handschrift des Ademar. Introduction and description by G. Thiele. *Codices graeci et latini photographice depicti*, Suppl. III. (H. Draheim).

11 July. J.-H. Breasted, *Ancient records of Egypt. Historical documents edited and translated with commentary. I. The first to the seventeenth dynasties* (A. Wiedemann), favourable. O. Weissenfels, *Aristoteles' Lehre vom Staat* (O. Döring). A. Bloch, *Le praefectus fabrum* (Fr. Fröhlich). 'A great advance on Mau's work of 1887 on this subject.' Nagelsbach, *Lateinische Stilistik*. 9. Aufl. von Iw. Müller (C. John).

18 July. O. Schrader, *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte. 3. Aufl. I. Zur Geschichte und Methode der linguistisch-historischen Forschung*

- (O. Weise), favourable. Sophocles *Antigone*, denuo recens. F. H. M. Blaydes (H. G.). 'Goes further in conjecture than can be approved.' *Der Obergermanisch-Raetische Limes des Römerreiches*. Lief. xi-xxvi (M. Ihm). *Florilegium patristicum*, dig. G. Rauschen. IV. *Tertulliani liber de praescriptione haereticorum* (accidunt S. Irenaei adversus haereses III, 3-4). V. *Vincentii Lerinensis communitoria* (J. Draeseke), very favourable.
- 25 July. G. Macdonald, *Coin types, their origin and development* (H. v. Fritze). 'Good, but not always convincing.' H. Brunn, *Kleine Schriften, gesamt*, von H. Bulle und H. Brunn. II. *Zur griechischen Kunstgeschichte* (A. Körte), favourable. *Die hellenische Kultur*, darg. von Fr. Baumgarten, Fr. Poland, R. Wagner (O. Weissenfels), favourable. W. v. Christ, *Griechische Nachrichten über Italien* (Fr. Matthias). K. Lehmann, *Die Angriffe der drei Barkiden auf Italien* (Fr. Reuss). 'The claim here made to have settled the route of Hannibal cannot be sustained.' W. Bauer, *Die Verfasser- und Zeitfrage des Dialogus de oratoribus* (G. Wörpel). E. Bacha, *Le génie de Tacite, la création des Annales* (F. Gustafsson), unfavourable. H. Kleingünther, *Quaestiones in Astronomicon libros qui sub Manilii nomine feruntur pertinentes* (Breiter), very favourable. G. Harendza, *De oratorio genere dicendi, quo Hieronymus in epistulis usus sit* (C. Weymann), favourable.
- 8 Aug. Chr. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (F. Solmsen), very favourable. E. v. Mach, *Handbook of Greek and Roman Sculpture* (Th. Schreiber), favourable. *Horatius*, erkl. von A. Kiessling. II. *Satiren*. 3. Aufl. von R. Heinze (O. Weissenfels).
- 15 Aug. M. Moore, *Carthage of the Phoenicians in the light of modern excavation* (O. Meltzer), favourable. J. Sitzler, *Ein ästhetischer Kommentar zu Homers Odyssee*. 2. Aufl. (Chr. Harder). M. Boas, *De epigrammatis Simonideis*. I. *Commentatio critica de epigrammatum traditione* (L. Weber), favourable. J. Dietze, *Komposition und Quellenbenutzung in Ovids Metamorphosen* (K. P. Schulze). 'Rather incomplete.' J. Samuelsson, *Studia in Valerium Flaccum*. II. (R. Helm). H. Gummerus, *Der römische Gutsbetrieb als wirtschaftlicher Organismus nach den Werken des Cato, Varro und Columella* (B. Kübler). K. Zangemeister, *Theodor Mommsen als Schriftsteller. Ein Verzeichnis seiner Schriften*. Continued by E. Jacobs (E. Kornemann).
- 29 Aug. R. Encken. *Beiträge zur Einführung in die Geschichte der Philosophie* (O. Weissenfels). Hitzig, *Die Bedeutung des altgriechischen Rechtes für die vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft* (J. Pfaff), very favourable. *Aristophanis Pax*, ed. J. van Leeuwen (J. Wagner). A. Rüegg, *Beiträge zur Erforschung der Quellenverhältnisse in der Alexander Geschichte des Curtius* (Fr. Reuss), unfavourable. H. Krüger, *Kurze Anleitung zur Erlernung des Neugriechischen für solche, welche Altgriechisch können* (G. Wartenberg), favourable.
- 5 Sept. Ph. Champault, *Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie d'après l'Odyssée* (Chr. Harder), unfavourable. H. Jordan, *Der Erzählungsstil in den Kampfszenen der Ilias* (Chr. Harder), favourable. A. Castiglioni, *De nonnullis Arriani anabases locis disputatio* (Fr. Reuss). B. Niese, *Grundriss der römischen Geschichte nebst Quellenkunde*. 3. Aufl. (E. Kornemann). C. Bretschneider, *Quo ordine ediderit Tacitus singulas Annalium partes* (Ed. Wolff), favourable. H. Joachim, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. 3. Aufl. (O. Weissenfels).
- 12 Sept. T. Zanghieri, *Studi su Bacchilide* (J. Sitzler), favourable on the whole. Sophocles. *The Philoctetes*, with a commentary abridged from the larger edition of Sir R. Jebb by E. S. Shuckburgh (H. Steinberg), favourable. *Anonymer Kommentar zu Platons Theaetetus* (Papyrus 9782) nebst drei Bruchstücken philosophischen Inhalts unter Mitwirkung von J. L. Heiberg bearb. von H. Diels und W. Schubart [Berliner Klassikertexte II.] (F. Jacoby). E. Schwartz, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln* (F. K. Ginzel). M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. III. *Die Zeit von Hadrian 117 bis auf Constantin 324*, 2. Aufl. (Fr. Harder), very favourable. R. Preiswerk, *De inventionis orationum Ciceronianarum* (J. Tolkiehn), favourable.
- 19 Sept. H. Schultz, *De elocutionis Pindaricae colore epico* (J. Sitzler), favourable, 'but the title is too wide.' A. Furtwängler, *Die Aegineten in der Glyptothek König Ludwigs I. nach den Resultaten der neuen bayerischen Ausgrabung* (C. Watzinger). M. V. Groote, *Die Entstehung des ionischen Kapitells und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Baukunst*, unfavourable. R. Maisch, *Griechische Altertumskunde*, neu bearb. von Fr. Pohlhammer, 3. Aufl. (Schneider). F. Knoke, *Begriff der Tragödie nach Aristoteles* (Chr. Muff), favourable. P. H. Edwards, *The poetic element in the Satires and Epistles of Horace*. I. (O. Weissenfels), favourable. J. P. Waltzing, *Studia Minuciana* (Boenig), 'Goes too far from the MS.' Th. Gsell, *Rom und die Campagna*, 6. Aufl. (H. Belling).
- 26 Sept. P. Menge, *De poetarum scaeniorum graecorum sermone observationes selectae* (H. G.), favourable. W. Gemoll, *Bemerkungen zu Xenophons Anabasis*. V. (Fr. Reuss). W. A. Merrill, *On the influence of Lucretius on Horace* (O. Weissenfels), favourable. Suetonii, *De Vita Caesarum libri VIII.*, rec. L. Preud'homme (Th. Stangl), 'A great advance on Roth's edition.' G. W. Botsford, *On the Distinction between Comitium and Concilium* (E. Wolff), unfavourable. Ch. Diehl, *Figures Byzantines* (G. Wartenberg), favourable. G. N. Hatzidakis, *Die Sprachfrage in Griechenland* (G. Wartenberg).

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. lxi. 2. 1906.

F. Marx, *De Sicili cantilena*. Inscription in Jan., suppl. ad mus. script. Graec. p. 38 explained. W. Vollgraff, *AABPTZ*. Lists of local names in λαβ(ρ)υ, λαυ(ρ)υ, λαρ(ρ)υ, λας, λαμ, λατμ, λατ. The author believes that all (or most) are connected with the name of the pre-Hellenic god worshipped at Labranda and given the emblem of the double axe. Cp. Etruscan names in Lar, etc. E. Norden, *De uitis Vergilianis*. The interpolations of the 2nd Berne MS. belong to the Renaissance. The 'Servian' life is an abridgement of the genuine work of Servius. The Probus life is a forgery—the only statement not found elsewhere, that as to the distance of Andes from Mantua, is incorrect. R. Meier, *De Pseudo-Heronianis*. M. Pokrowskij, *Zur lateinischen Etymologie und Wortbildungslehre*. Actutum, celeber, haruspex, Fontinalia, Frutinal, uiduertas, ignosco, serenus. W. Bannier, *Zu den attischen Rechnungswirkunden des 5. Jahrhunderts*. The older documents arranged for the whole year, the later ones for prytanies. The change began between Ol. 89^o and 90^o. P. Cauer, *Zur Abgrenzung und Verbindung der Theile in Horazens Ars Poetica*. A. v. Mess, *Untersuchungen über die Arbeitsweise Diodors*. Examination of Books 11-15 (mainly based on Ephoros). A. Elter, *Épave Élegie des Tibull. I. 3. ll. 53 sqq.* are addressed to Messalla, quod si meaning 'if then,' where 'then' refers to the general probability of death implied in ll. 1-8 and partly resumed in the preceding couplets. E.

Hefermehl, *Menekrates von Nysa und Die Schrift vom Erhabenen*. The Alexandrian Ammonius is discussed, and Menekrates assumed to be the authority for the section dealing with differences between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. An appendix deals with Porphyry's teacher Apollonius. *Miscellen*: F. Reuss, *Megasthenes*. A fresh point in favour of his birth in Asia Minor; G. Némethy, *Ad Ovid. A.A. iii. 783*. Phylleia mater = Thessala bacchans; P. Menge, *Zu Caesar B.G. 7, 35, 4*. Defends the old conjecture *carptis*; F. Buecheler, *NEOΨΗΘON*. Interpretation of Suet. Ner. 39; F. B., *Deferebant grandioribus*; K. Tittel, *Noch einmal die Pigna*.

Vol. lxi. 3. 1906.

A. Roemer, *Einige Interpolationen der Odyssee und Aristarch*. J. E. Kirchner, *Beiträge zur attischen Epigraphik*. 1. Priests of Asclepius. 2. Potamii Deirodiotae. F. Rühl, *Herakleides von Mylasa*. His manoeuvre described by Sosylus must have been practised against the Phoenicians, off C. Artemisium in Caria, not at the celebrated battle against the Persians. A. v. Mess, *Untersuch. über Ephoros*. Traces his use of Ctesias in combination with (1) Xenophon (2) Herodotus as main authorities. F. Reuss, *Der Leichenwagen Alexanders des Grossen*. Rejects Petersen's view of the πάλος in favour of Six's, except that R. thinks the freedom of movement may have extended to the hind wheels, not merely to the pole and front wheels. G. Crönert, *Lectiones Epicureae*. H. Raeder, *Ueber die Echtheit der platonischen Briefe*. If genuine, their date would fall in the years 366-352. An exam. from the point of view of hiatus and vocabulary reveals many points of agreement with just those dialogues which are generally regarded as later ones—*Laws*, *Sophist*, *Politicus*, *Timaeus*, *Philebus*. *Miscellen*: F. B., *AKPONTYX* (probably from *ἀνός*, and has to do with practice of athletes for breaking in bulls); F. Rühl, *Die Zeitanätze für Hellanikos*; A. Körte, *Anaximenes von Lampsakos als Alexanderhistoriker*. Didymos cites from *ἡ θ' τὴν περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον*, but there are difficulties in the way of believing that An. devoted 9 books to that king. We know he dealt with the history of Philip, and the last book quoted from the work is the 8th: possibly the Alexander books were numbered as if they were continuations of the work.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc. Vol. xvii. 5. 1906.

G. Finsler, *Das homerische Königtum*. 1. Banquets. 2. The King in the *Odyssey*. The *Iliad* reveals the existence of banquets (1) given by the King, (2) shared by the *ἑταῖροι* in common. In Hom. *λ.* 185 the invitation to the banquets is no part of the royal γάρος, only recognition of membership of the aristocracy. The poet of the *Odyssey* depicts the political conditions of his time from the standpoint of the ruling class, and the picture is of an aristocratic state quite different from that represented in the *Iliad*. G. Kettner, *Der Monolog Marfas in Schillers Demetrius*. R. M. Meyer, *Kriterien der Aneignung. Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: *Der röm. Limes in Oesterreich v., vi.* reviewed by W. Ruge.

Vol. xvii. 6. 1906.

G. Finsler, *Das homerische Königtum*. (contd.) 3. Asia Minor and Athens. 4. The King in the *Iliad*. Investigation reveals in Aeolia, Ionia, and Athens a ruling house, whose members rule by grace of nobility and bear, as being supreme in religious matters, the old title of king, until (as at Miletus and Athens) their office ceases to be hereditary and life-long,

and the priestly powers, together with the title of king, pass into the hands of another person. There is no historical trace of the existence of real monarchy in these regions. In the *Iliad* as a whole, owing to its subject-matter, the traditions of the past mingle more freely than in the *Odyssey* with the conditions of the days in which the poem was completed. G. Wolf, *Die Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen*. K. Reuschel, *Chamisso's Balladendichtung. Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: A. Furtwängler's *Die Aegineten der Glyptothek König Ludwigs I.* reviewed by J. I.

Vol. xvii. 7. 1906.

W. Wilcken, *Hellenen und Barbaren*. Relations between Greece and the East. 'The more we learn about the old Oriental nations the more respect we feel for their achievements, but we are also the clearer as regards the limits and directions of their talent, and, to my mind, the Greeks come proportionately nearer to us.' F. Kuntze, *Der Hauptmann von Kapernaum und die alten Bibelinterpreten*. A. Döring, *Schillers Stellung zum Lebensproblem*. E. Stemplinger, *Parodien zur Lyrik des Horaz*. Imitations and parodies in the strict sense. *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: Brunn-Bruckmann's *Denkmäler griech. und röm. Skulptur* (parts CX-CXIX) reviewed favourably by E. Petersen (with a good summary of the contents).

Vol. xvii. 8. 1906.

T. Zielinski, *Der antike Logos in der modernen Welt*. Appreciative, though critical, notice of *Die griech. und lat. Literatur und Sprache*. Thinks that the relation of the subject to modern culture is hardly so full as might be expected in view of the fact that the book is one of the volumes of *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*. F. Studniczka, *Die beiden Fassungen der Tyrannenmördergruppe*. Attempts, with help of a recently published *oenochoe*, to shew against Hauser that Critius and Nesiotes followed closely the work of Antenor, the later age appearing only in some finer points, such as the treatment of Harmodius' sword-arm. A. Müller, *Die Strafjustiz im röm. Heere*. I. Punishments. II. Offences and their punishments. The soldiers largely at the mercy of their officers. A. Werminghoff, *Die Briefe Dantes aus der Zeit von Heinrichs VII. Romzug. Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*. J. Oeri, *Hellenisches in der Medicerkapelle* interprets the reclining figures in the light of Plato's Phaedo: Crepusculo and Aurora represent *Sterben* and *Wiederaufleben*, *Notte* and *Giorno* *Death* and *Life*; H. Brunn's *Kleine Schriften 3. Bde.*, noticed by E. Petersen; Ad. Schulten's *Numantia*, noticed by E. Lammert. 'Appian's account of topography so accurate as to point to a good source, namely Polybius. Excavation necessary, and likely to be as productive as at Alesia.'

Archiv für lat. Lexicographie und Grammatik. xv. 1. 1906.

K. Brugmann, *Senex, iuvenis*. E. Wölfflin, *Die Sprache des Claud. Quadrigarius*. Not much more archaic than was to be expected in Sulla's time, adopted poetic diction freely, extended the use of the abl. abs. H. Peter, *Zur Textesgeschichte der Scriptores hist. Aug.* Patzig's attempt to find a tradition independent of P a failure. F. Vollmer, *Lexicographisches aus Horaz*. F. Skutsch, *Zur lat. Syntax*. The adjective *vetus*; *victoria arma*, etc.; nom. for voc.; partitive gen. depending on such advbs. as *adfatim*, *largiter*; *foras*, *foris* *refert* = *res fert*, the use of *tua*, etc. being due to mistaken belief of the Romans that the first syllable was the abl.

O. Hey, *Aus dem Kaiserlichen Kanzleistil*. E. W., *Fatidicus*. M. Ihm, *Die Apicius-Excerpte im cod. Salmas.* Text, commentary. T. Birt, *Einiges was uns die Handschriften lehren*. Esp. *et quis* and a dative form *quo* in e.g. Varro, Cicero. F. Marx, *Pepercit sum. Perpertum fuisse* in a papyrus, *pepercitum fuerit* in Lucifer. R. Heinze, *Supplicium*. In Plautus means the fine paid to an injured party voluntarily and after negotiation with him by the wrong-doer. So in sacral matters the offering to offended heaven. E. Hauler, *Lepturgus, chirurgus u. ä. bei Fronto*. W. Otto *Mania und Lares*. M. Pokrowskij, *Zum Thesaurus gloss. emend.* E. Lommatsch, *Zur lat. Orthographie*. EI for I in Inscriptions of the Empire. Idem, *Zu Carm. Epigr.* 2. Notes the spelling AASTUTIEIS. A. Brinkmann, *Simpulium—simpulum*. The latter a mere *Ms.* corruption. *Miscellen*: W. M. Lindsay, *Hercules*, 5. *Dekl.*; F. Skutsch, *Persona*; A. Becker, *Zur Aussprache des C. Literatur*: Schlossman's *Persona* und ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ in Recht und in christlichen Dogma, A. Souter's *Study of Ambrosiaster*.

Mnemosyne. xxxiv. 3. 1906.

S. A. Naber, *Ad Callimachum*. Conjectures. P. H. D., Cicero. Gloss contained in Verr. iv. 55. P. H. Damsté, *Ad lib. de bello Africano*. Conjectures. v. L., *Ad Hom.* X 126 *sqq.* Puella audaciam uirilem uerita e tuto loco, eminus cum eo verba serit: mihi comminus adloquendus est qui in me inruit. J. v. Leeuwen, *Homericæ* (from last part). 27. De heroum Homericorum curribus bellicis. 28. De thoracis in carm. Hom. usu. 29. De Thetide Pelei uxore. 30. De nomine Achillis. 31. De Innone Troianis infesta. Id., *Ad Terent. Eunuch.* iii. 5. 40. *In imbrem* for *in hominem*. J. J. Hartman, *De Plutarchi studiis Latinis*. Tac.'s *Historie* was the work which induced P. to study Latin, and to this refers the *τάχος* of Vit. Dem. 2. He was familiar with Livy, Nepos, Val. Max., Sall., Cicero (esp. *de Senectute*), and in the Lucullus (39) cites Horace. H. v. Herwerden, *Platonica* (contd.) Conjectures on Protag., Euthyphro, Theaetetus, Sophist, Politicus. Id., *ΦΑΒΙΟΣ—ΦΑΒΙΟΣ*. H. J. Polak, *Varia*. On inscriptions, etc. in *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* 28. P. H. Damsté, *De Hymno quodam*. v. L., *Ad. schol. Hom.* K 515.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches=10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

. Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.

Abbott (Edwin A.) Silanus the Christian. 9" x 5½". Pp. 368. London. Adam and Charles Black. 1906. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Aristophanes. The Frogs of Aristophanes. Edited with introduction, commentary, and critical notes by T. G. Tucker, Litt. D. 6½" x 4". Pp. ix + 276. London, Macmillan and Co. 1906. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Clemens Alexandrinus, see Gabrielsson (Johannes).

Deonna (W.) Les Statues de terre-cuite en Grèce. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 74. Paris, A. Fontemoing. 1906. 2s. 6d.

Favorinus, see Gabrielsson (Johannes).

Gabrielsson (Johannes) Ueber die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus. Erster Theil. 9" x 6". Pp. x + 253. Upsala, Lundström; Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 1906.

— Ueber Favorinus und seine *παραδοχή ιστορία*. 9" x 6". Pp. 67. Same publishers and date.

Hersman (Anne Bates) Studies in Greek Allegorical Interpretation. I. Before Plutarch, II. Plutarch. (*Chicago Degree Dissertation.*) 9½" x 6½". Pp. 64. Chicago, The Blue Sky Press. 1906.

Isteil (Walterus) De Senecae dialogo undecimo qui est ad Polybium de Consolatione. (*Marburg Degree Dissertation.*) 8½" x 5½". Pp. iv + 76. Marburg Cattorum, typis Fr. Scheel Cassellani. 1906.

Lawton (Frederick), see Rodocanachi (E.).

Moulton (James Hope) A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. I. Prolegomena. Second

Edition, with corrections and additions. 9½" x 5½". Pp. xx + 284. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark. 1906. Cloth, 8s. net.

Plato, see Schneider (Dr. G.).

Plutarch, see Hersman (Anne Bates).

Ramsay (W. M.), see *Studies in the History and Art*, etc.

Renkema (E. H.) Observationes criticae et exegeticae ad C. Valerii Flacci Argonautica scriptis E. H. R. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 90. Trajecti ad Rhenum apud Kemink et filium. 1906.

Rodocanachi (E.) The Roman Capitol in ancient and modern times. The Citadel—The Temples—The Senatorial Palace—The Palace of the Conservators—The Museum, by E. R. Translated from the French by Frederick Lawton, M.A. 6½" x 4½". Pp. xvi + 264 with 50 illustrations and a map. London, William Heinemann. 1906. Cloth, 4s. net. (5 Fr.)

Schneider (Dr. Gustav) Schülerkommentar zu Platon's Apologie des Sokrates und Kriton nebst den Schlusskapiteln des Phaidon und der Lobrede des Alkibiades auf Sokrates aus dem Symposium. Von Dr. G. S. Zweite Auflage. 7½" x 5". Pp. 94. Leipzig, G. Freytag; Wien., F. Tempsky. 1906. Steifbrotschiert 80 Pf. = 1 K.

Seneca, see Isteil (Walterus).

Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire written for the Quatercentenary of the University of Aberdeen by seven of its graduates, edited by W. M. Ramsay.

- (*Aberdeen University Studies*, No. 20.) 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " \times 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".
 Pp. xvi + 392. Aberdeen, University Press.
 1906.
- Tucker* (T. G.), see *Aristophanes*.
- Vergil*. P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos, liber x, xi,
 xii. Edited by S. E. Winbolt, M.A. (*Blackie's*
Latin Texts.) 7" \times 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xiv + 30, xiv + 30,
 xii + 32. London, Blackie and Son. 1906.
 Cloth, each 6d. net.
- Walters* (H. B.) *The Art of the Greeks*. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " \times 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ".
 Pp. xvi + 278 with 112 plates and 18 illustrations
 in the text. London, Methuen and Co. 1906.
 Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Winbolt* (S. E.), see *Vergil*.

